DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 138 378 RC 009 820

AUTHOR	Wilkinson, Kenneth P.; Ross, Peggy J.
TITLE	Experiments in Social Welfare: An Empirical Evaluation of the "Mississippi Project". Mississippi State University, Social Science Research Center Report 38.
INSTITUTION	Mississippi State Univ., State College. Social Science Research Center.
SPONS AGENCY	Social and Rehabilitation Service (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Dec 70
NOTE	77p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Attitudes; Blacks; *Change Strategies; *Comparative Analysis; Females; Financial Support; Followup Studies; Income; Life Style; Occupational Mobility; *Program Evaluation; *Rural Areas; Social Change; *Social Welfare; *Socioeconomic Status; Special Services; Training
IDENTIFIERS	*Mississippi

ABSTRACT

Focusing on a 2-county rural area of Mississippi, 230 female Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) recipients were divided into 4 groups to ascertain the differential effects that additions of higher levels of financial assistance and/or services over a period of a year (1967-68) would have on life styles and potentials for upward mobility. Reflecting distinctive concepts of public assistance, the four groups included: (1) a control group; (2) Title V: Training and Income; (3) 1115: Special Services; and (4) 1115: Income Only. Data on the program variables were collected via official records and case worker/researcher consultations and a follow-up interview. Changes in financial status, life style, and personal orientations were examined. Results indicated: the greatest number of significantly different changes occurred among recipients of both training and income (Group II); followed by those receiving income only; changes among income only recipients were more clearly seen in immediate changes in family financial status than in style of life or personal orientation; there was some evidence that work experience and training in Group II was beginning by the time of the second interview to effect the degree of client rationality regarding work; substantial change in client welfare required substantial input (level of input was the most predictive factor in the study). (JC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED138378

MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIVERSITY

MAY 197
ERIC/
RECEIVED

SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH CENTER

EXPERIMENTS IN SOCIAL WELFARE :

AN EMPIRICAL EVALUATION OF THE " MISSISSIPPI PROJECT "

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Kenneth P. Wilkinson

Peggy J. Ross

R0009820

Report 38

EXPERIMENTS IN SOCIAL WELFARE: AN EMPIRICAL EVALUATION OF THE "MISSISSIPPI PROJECT"

Kenneth P. Wilkinson and Peggy J. Ross

Report 38

Social Science Research Center
Mississippi State University
State College, Mississippi

December, 1970

Mississippi State University does not discriminate on
the grounds of race, color, or national origin.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was supported in part by a grant to the Social Science Research Center from the Social and Rehabilitation Service, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare for a study entitled "Evaluation of the Mississippi Combined Title V-IIIS Project." Acknowledgement is made of the contribution of Dr. Perry Levinson of the Social and Rehabilitation Service to the design of the study.

During the first year of the study, Dr. James S. Wittman, now of Western Kentucky State University, served as research director for the project while on a visiting appointment in the Social Science Research Center. He was responsible for all phases of the "before" survey and has contributed greatly to the analysis and interpretation of findings. Dr. Satadal Dasgupta, now of University of Prince Edward Island, Canada, worked with the authors during the second year of field work and analysis. Others who have participated in the research include Dr. Arthur R. Jones, now of Rollins College, and graduate assistants Sangeeta S. Singh, Enrique Codas and Susan E. Whittington.

The study would not have been possible without a high level of cooperation with the staff of the Mississippi Project. Special thanks go to Mr. O. E. Catledge who had administrative responsibility for the project within the Mississippi Department of Public Welfare and to Miss Patsy Brewer who served as project director.

The summary percents and results of statistical tests presented herein are documented by mimeographed frequency tables which form an appendix to this report and are available on request from the Social Science Research Center.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
LIST OF TABLES	v
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose of the Study	1
Organization of the Study	2
Design of the Study	3
Methods of Research	4
Population Variables	6
The Program Variables	9
Group I : Control Group	10
Group II : Title V Training and Income	10
Group III: 1115 Special Services	12
Group IV : 1115 Income Only	13
Selected Comparisons	13
Limitations and Strengths	15
CHAPTER II: FINDINGS	19
Overview	19
Financial Status	20
Life Style	29
Personal Orientations	39
CHAPTER III: CONCLUSIONS	61
Summary of Findings	61
Group Comparisons	63
Group I : Control Group	64
Group II : Title V Training and Income	64
Group III: 1115 Special Services	65
Group IV : 1115 Income Only	66
Overall Differences	67
Policy Implications	68

LIST OF TABLES

		PAGE
Table 1.	Selected characteristics of clients by group assignments	8
Table 2.	Financial inputs to client groups	14
Table 3.	Clients' observation about caseworkers after one year of program operation	16
Table 4.	Clients' reactions to programs	17
Table 5.	Changes in employment status	22
Table 6.	Changes in sources of family income	23
Table 7.	Changes in amounts of family income	25
Table 8.	Clients' perceptions of changes during the year in amounts of money available to them to meet their needs	26
Table 9.	Changes in expenditures for selected items	28
Table 10.	Change in percent of income in previous month spent for selected items	30
Table 11.	Changes in indebtedness	30
Table 12.	Changes in housing status	31
Table 13.	Changes in percent possessing selected household items	33
Table 14.	Frequency with which selected foods are eaten	35
Table 15.	Percent whose families had selected foods during previous two days	36
Table 16.	Use of medical and dental services by clients and their children	37
Table 17.	Change in voluntary social participation	39
Table 18.	Change in percent engaged in selected leisure-time activities in previous month	40
Table 19.	Change in experience of selected problems in previous year	42
Table 20.	Change in non-verbal test performance scores	43

PAGE

Table 21. Change in occupational aspirations and expectations for self and child 44

Table 22. Change in educational aspiration and expectations for oldest child 45

Table 23. Change in percent willing to accept selected conditions in order to get a job earning $300-$400 a month 46

Table 24. Change in preference of job over welfare check under selected conditions 48

Table 25. Change in attitudes toward welfare clients. 50

Table 26. Change in attitudes toward the welfare department . . . 51

Table 27. Change in perceptions of others' reactions to one's welfare status. 52

Table 28. Change in attitudes expressing powerlessness. 53

Table 29. Change in attitudes expressing isolation. 55

Table 30. Change in selected attitudes toward society 57

Table 31. Satisfaction with community characteristics 59

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the Study

The essential philosophy and objective of social work has been stated many times as "helping people to help themselves." The individual, it is assumed, however disadvantaged he may be at the moment, is his own greatest hope for a better future. Responsibility is ascribed ultimately to the individual, and with it dignity. In theory, social workers and agencies serve as resources to the individual as he is guided to realize and actualize his own abilities and potentialities.

While the gap between philosophy and practice, especially in institutionalized public welfare programs, has been documented many times, the ideal of "helping people help themselves" remains a basic theme in the ethos of welfare programs and agencies in this society. How this can be accomplished, given the constraints often placed upon public assistance programs and the multidimensional characteristics of the problem of poverty in America, is a major question for research and policy. Literally hundreds of new, special projects to encourage economic self-sufficiency among recipients of public welfare have been undertaken in this country, mostly by the federal government, during the past half-century, frequently on a demonstration basis. In a very general sense, these projects have been based upon implicit assumptions about the fundamental ways in which the poor are different from other members of the society and about ways in which these differences might be lessened.

Reflecting this dialogue of assumptions is the current debate over whether the poor are "qualitatively" or "quantitatively" different from the rest of the society. The difference is of more than academic interest as the orientation that one takes in the allocation of funds for welfare programs can often hinge on the position taken on this issue. If it is assumed that the difficulties of the poor, dependent families are the result of "qualitative differences," investment should be in such programs as vocational rehabilitation and occupational training. What must be altered is the culture rather than merely the condition of poverty. Conversely, if it is assumed that the manifested difficulties are the result of "quantitative" differences, what is needed is a program to raise income levels.[1] A middle road is also possible. It may be that

---

1. For background of this dialogue see H. F. Kaufman, K. P. Wilkinson and L. W. Cole, Poverty Programs and Social Mobility, Social Science Research Center, Report 13, Mississippi State University, September 1966. For more recent treatments, see Committee for Economic Development, Improving the Public Welfare System, a Statement on National Policy by the Research and Policy Committee, New York: April 1970, and Elmo R. Rusco, "The Family Assistance Act," University of Nevada, Governmental Research Newsletter, April 1970.

those families afforded both alternatives simultaneously would profit the most.

While the national investment in social welfare demonstration projects expressing these alternative assumptions has continued to expand, the effects of these on the level of client and family functioning have only been partially evaluated. Without careful assessment, the relative merits of any given project might be lost or incorrectly estimated while errors could be repeated were the project to serve as a prototype. It is significant that during recent years, as serious attention has been given to the possibility of establishing a national income maintenance program, the investment in evaluation research has increased.[1]

The purpose of this study was to ascertain the differential effects that additions of higher levels of financial assistance and/or services over a period of one year would have on the life styles and potentials for upward social mobility of selected families receiving public welfare assistance. The selected client families were recipients of the nation's largest and perhaps most controversial public welfare program, Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC).* The study focused upon a two-county, rural area of central Mississippi.

Organization of the Study

The study was initiated and conducted as a cooperative effort involving agencies of federal and state government and university personnel. Two units within the Bureau of Family Services,** namely the Demonstration Projects Section and the Office of Special Services, provided funding through the Mississippi Department of Public Welfare for the principal action components of the demonstration project. The Demonstration Projects Section, authorized under Section 1115, Title XI of the Social Security Act, provided increased financial assistance and special services to selected clients in Madison County. The Office of Special Services provided funding for a work experience and training program in adjoining Attala County. This was supported under Title V of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 which authorized programs to develop and upgrade employable skills thus improving the employability of the main provider in families with needy children.

---

1. A recent survey of experiments and evaluations is reported in Helen O. Nicol, "The Economist and Aspects of Social Welfare Research," Welfare in Review, (March-April 1970), pp. 1-10.

* This program was entitled Aid to Dependent Children prior to passage of Public Law 87-543, the Public Welfare Amendments of 1962.

** Social and Rehabilitation Service, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

The Division of Community Services within the Mississippi Department of Public Welfare was responsible for administering and conducting the demonstration project. The combined 1115-Title V effort was named the "Mississippi Project," with the staff directly responsible to the state welfare department. A project office was established in Madison County in November, 1967, with a director, responsible for the 1115 and Title V projects, a casework supervisor for both counties, two caseworkers for Madison County, and one caseworker for Attala County.

The research component was funded by a matching grant from the Office of Research and Demonstrations, SRS, HEW, to the Social Science Research Center, Mississippi State University. The research project director was consulted on major decisions regarding operation of the demonstration project and maintained close contact with the local staff throughout the study. An effort was made to minimize the impact of the research on aspects of the demonstration project other than those in which an input from the research was part of the overall design, e.g. as in selection of clients to receive various project components.

Design of the Study

The evaluative design of the study followed what has been described as a "goal-model" approach.[1] This is one of several models for conceptualizing the relationships among a constellation of variables in a purposive change process. As with many other models, it focuses only upon population and program variables and thus requires an assumption of constancy and supportiveness in the broader situational milieu. While this assumption needs to be examined carefully at the sociological level,[2] it provides a means of focusing study. In interpreting the findings of such focused study, however, it is important to recognize that influences of situational and social-structural variables have not been taken into account.

As described by Levinson, "the basic flow through the goal-model begins with (1) an incoming group (called simply Income) possessing certain population characteristics to whom (2) something is done (the program Input-Output components) which in turn produces (3) a desired change (Outcome) assuming that (4) certain attitudinal and cognitive changes have previously occurred (the Intermediate variables). Income in the present case consisted of AFDC recipients in the selected counties. Inputs included the 1115 and Title V program components. Outputs were the actual levels of operation of these programs. Outcome variables represent the long-range objectives of the programs, namely economic self-sufficiency and personal resource actualization of the clients and

---

1. See Perry Levinson, "Evaluation of Social Welfare Programs: Two Research Models," Welfare in Review, (December 1966).

2. See H. F. Kaufman, K. P. Wilkinson, and L. W. Cole, op. cit.

their children. Intermediate variables of interest in the study had to do with changes in attitudes and knowledge concerning work, self, society, community resources and the like.

There is, of course, a serious question as to whether movement toward long-range goals can be evaluated over a period of time as short as the duration of the demonstration project. "Hard" indicators of short-range changes, such as changes in employment status, movement off welfare, job retention, and increased earnings, might reflect fundamental changes in mobility potentials. On the other hand, these changes might reflect temporary gains to be followed by frustration and regression when the support of the program variables is removed. Within the temporal limits of the study, and recognizing the operation of unmeasured situational and structural variables, it was necessary to focus upon the intermediate variables, that is, upon the variables which were hypothesized to have changed in such a way as to be facilitative of later upward social mobility.

The program inputs were designed to reflect distinctive concepts of public assistance. One group of clients, under the Title V program received increased financial assistance in the form of payment for attending vocational orientation classes and for participating in on-the-job training arranged by the caseworker. A second group, under the 1115 program, received free medical, dental and other services and experiences for themselves and their families. A third group, also under 1115, received increased financial assistance only. A control group, which continued to receive the usual level of support and services, was a base against which the differential impacts of the three types of support could be compared.

Methods of Research

The research design called for base-line and follow-up measures of the intermediate variables with the program variables to be in operation for one year. The plan was to include 100 female clients in <u>each</u> county. These would be AFDC mothers whose backgrounds, work histories and family circumstances would indicate a favorable chance of successfully completing the work experience and training program. The clients would then be randomly assigned among four groups of 50 each. This plan was revised prior to the first period of interviewing to allow for (1) possible refusals, movement from the state, deaths and other factors which might make interviewing impossible, (2) the possibility that some clients might choose not to participate in the demonstration program, and (3) the possibility that the AFDC caseload in Attala County, which was smaller than in Madison County, might not include 100 clients who could meet the criteria for participation. The size of the study group was raised to 238, which included virtually all of those in the two counties who were judged by the caseworkers to be eligible. A decision was also made to draw one-half of the control group from each county, rather than taking all of these from Attala County as originally planned.

Population and intermediate variables were measured first through structured interviews prior to initiation of the demonstration programs.

A preliminary interview schedule covering family structure, level of living, socioeconomic characteristics, social relationships, attitudes regarding work, welfare and society, and selected personal resources was pretested (N=14) in mid-September, 1967, and modified for use in the field study. Field work in Madison and Attala Counties began October 1. Interviewers for the study were recruited from among local residents with the aid of welfare agents in each county. The interviews were completed during three weeks, by October 24, with no refusals, break-offs, or adverse community reactions. Of the 238 schedules, 230 were judged to be usable and the clients were assigned by the research director to the four groups as follows:

Group I (Control Group)	- 56 (28 Madison, 28 Attala)
Group II (Title V: Training and Income)	- 60 (Attala)
Group III (1115: Special Services)	- 58 (Madison)
Group IV (1115: Income Only)	- 56 (Madison)
Total	- 230 (142 Madison, 88 Attala)

As soon as this period of field interviewing was completed, the research director gave the director of the Mississippi Project the four lists of names. The reserve (over the 50 originally planned) in each group was to be used to make up for any refusals, etc. in the program groups. The programs were begun in the two counties on November 1, 1967.

Data on the program variables were collected throughout the year by the caseworkers in consultation with the researchers. In addition to official records of all inputs, data were collected on the operation of the programs, and on levels of participation of clients and caseworkers.

The follow-up interviews were completed after one year of program operation, in November, 1968. The interview schedule repeated the critical measures of the intermediate variables which had been included earlier plus selected measures of the clients' reactions to the program variables and to significant events of the intervening year. All but six of the 230 clients were reinterviewed. Forty-three of those interviewed at both time periods were clients who had been assigned to one of the program groups but who, for reasons discussed below, had not participated in the programs during the year. Omitting these from the analysis,*

---

* Characteristics of these 43 clients are shown in the appendix tables where they are labeled as Group V, Residuals. These were not included in the control group because of the manner in which they were selected and because of the variety of the reasons why they did not participate.

left the following distribution:

Group I:	56
Group II:	31
Group III:	46
Group IV:	48
Total	181

During the year a decision was made to extend some aspects of the demonstration project through June, 1969, rather than terminating it as planned by December, 1968. As a consequence the second interviews were held during rather than after the program experience of some clients. The program data for use in the research were collected for the twelve-month period only.

Population Variables

The counties withing which the study was conducted are located adjacent to one another in the central part of Mississippi: Madison County was slightly larger in 1960 with a population of 32,904 compared to 21,335 in Attala, and had more non-whites, 72 percent as compared to 45 percent in Attala. About one-fourth of the labor force of each county was in agriculture. The median family income in 1959 was $2,116 in Attala and $1,862 in Madison. Among non-whites, the median family incomes were $1,166 and $1,113 respectively. More than three-fifths of the families in each county had incomes under $3,000. During 1967, AFDC assistance in the amount of $97,247 was distributed in Attala County and $227,703 in Madison. The number of assistance units that year was 309 in Attala and 677 in Madison.

The clients included in the analysis were in many ways similar to AFDC recipients throughout Mississippi and the South. All were female. All but five were black. Three-fifths lived in rural areas; only one-third were employed, these mostly in lower status occupations. Occupational histories were restricted entirely to the lowest status jobs. All but two of the clients were born in Mississippi. The median education was seven years with only three percent having completed high school. The median age of clients was 36.4 years. Only one in eight owned their homes, and only one-third had more than three of 13 popular household conveniences. A detailed analysis of all data collected in the before survey has shown the population under study to be one in which a number of profoundly handicapping factors and barriers to social mobility have coalesced.[1]

---

1. This analysis has been presented in three master of arts theses in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Mississippi State University: Peggy Johnston Ross, Individual Factors in Mobility Potential: A Study of Selected AFDC Recipients (August 1968), Sangeeta Sworup Singh, The Alienation Syndrome: A Before and After Study of the Welfare Poor (May 1970), and Susan Efferson Whittington, The Occupational Aspirations of Selected AFDC Recipients (August 1970).

Family characteristics reflected in part the dependent status of the clients. Only 10 percent were married at the time of the first interview. The mean number of children under 18 living with the clients was 3.7, and the median household size was 5.7 persons. Only 16 percent reported that they had never been married, and only three clients had been married more than twice. One-third had siblings on welfare, but less than one in eight had been in families on welfare during their youth.

Comparisons among groups on selected characteristics are shown in Table 1. As will be noted below in the more detailed comparisons, the initial differences among groups were generally slight. An exception shown in Table I was on percent married which varied from 23 percent in Group II to none in Group IV.

The clients as a whole were not, however, a homogeneous grouping of people. They differed among themselves in age, size of family, education, health, housing, work experience, aspirations for themselves and their children, and many other factors. They were individuals with specific needs, interests, abilities, backgrounds and aspirations. As may be seen in the comparisons to follow, they varied in age from under twenty to over sixty, from having responsibility for one child to ten or more children, from no formal schooling to some college training, from no health problems to serious health problems, from inadequate to adequate housing, from no work experience to previous full-time employment, and from low aspirations for self and children to high aspirations for self and children.

In most cases, the families were deprived of the natural father due to death, desertion, disability or non-marriage of the mother. The majority were existing in dire poverty even with their AFDC grants.

Many families lived in unpainted, poorly constructed, wood-frame houses that were either rectangular or square with a porch in bad repair surrounded by a dirt yard cluttered with useless debris. The small rooms of the houses were often overcrowded. Kitchens and living rooms were used frequently for sleeping quarters. Many had no inside bath and toilet facilities. Only a few of those with inside running water had hot water heaters. The floors were usually bare or sparsely covered with old worn pieces of linoleum or carpet. Windows were sometimes uncovered. The majority had electricity and used it mainly for lighting. Some still used kerosene lamps. Wood was used for heating and cooking by some. The houses were simple in design, often with no closets. In such cases, clothes hung on nails along walls or, on wash day might be placed outside on bushes or fences to dry. The furniture was generally simple and functional. It was not uncommon to find a large glass-framed picture of a national leader in the living room. Otherwise, decorations were seldom seen except for a few occasional snap-shot photographs of family members and perhaps a religious card or picture.

Diets often tended to be very starchy, consisting heavily of rice, potatoes, biscuits and corn bread. Vegetables were eaten in season, but

Table 1. Selected characteristics of clients by group assignment

Characteristics	Group I Control Group (N=56)	Group II Training & Income (N=31)	Group III Special Services (N=46)	Group IV Income Only (N=48)
Percent non-white	96.4	90.3	100.0	100.0
Median age (yrs.)	36	43	37	32
Median education (yrs.)	7	7	8	7
Percent married	14.3	22.6	2.2	-
Percent never married	23.2	9.7	34.8	22.9
Percent married twice or more	12.5	16.2	15.2	12.5
Mean number of children in household	3.9	2.9	3.8	3.9
Mean number of children had in lifetime*	5.2	5.8	5.8	5.3
Percent with other adults in household (excluding spouse)	50.0	26.0	37.0	38.0
Percent home owners	17.8	19.4	8.7	8.3
Percent rural	55.4	58.1	56.5	58.2
Percent born in county of present residence	71.4	83.9	91.2	75.0
Percent employed	33.9	22.6	41.3	29.2
Percent with income other than public assistance	35.7	54.9	39.1	31.3
Percent whose family received welfare during their youth	10.8	3.2	10.9	18.8
Percent with siblings now on welfare	28.6	38.7	41.3	31.3
Percent Baptist	69.6	67.7	67.4	62.5

* Time #2. Others are Time #1.

limited in variety. Milk was only an occasional item for some families. Few had cars or sewing machines or subscribed to newspapers or magazines. Items such as vacuum cleaners, air conditioners, and central heating were rarely found. Most had a radio or television set.

The great majority were born in the county in which they lived at the time of the initial interview. Work experience for most consisted of farm or domestic labor. Recreation consisted primarily of visits with relatives and a few friends. Few indicated that they ever played cards, ate out, or attended parties, movies, dances or picnics.

Many indicated that they would rather work than receive any form of welfare, especially if the amount per month for working would be greater than welfare funds. Few expressed any sense of stigma as a result of receiving welfare funds. Most would like for all of their children to finish high school, and many hoped that their children would go to college.

The Program Variables

As noted above, the programs were conducted as a joint effort of state and federal agencies with a project office and staff separate from the local welfare departments but answerable to the State Department of Public Welfare. The project director was a social worker with one year of graduate study and two years of casework experience. The casework supervisor held a bachelor's degree in sociology and two years experience. The caseworkers were college graduates, none with social work training, and with experience ranging from six months to two years. In Groups II and III, the same caseworkers continued throughout the program. Three caseworkers served Group IV with periods ranging from one to eight months.

Recruitment of clients into the three program groups began in November, 1967, at the close of the initial interviewing period, and continued into September, 1968, as clients completed or dropped out of various phases of the programs. When the pool of clients selected for the study had been exhausted, a few other AFDC clients from the two counties were recruited into the programs.*

Data on program variables were collected from two sources. The primary source consisted of project records and information collected by teachers, supervisors, employers, and caseworkers. A secondary source consisted of items included in the follow-up interviews of the participating clients.

---

* These were excluded from the study group.

Group I: Control Group

As a control group, most of the clients (and many of the 43 non-participants excluded from the analysis) continued to receive AFDC grants, according to the existing state policy, and the caseworker services usually provided to clients. In Mississippi, the level of support consisted of a maximum of 27 percent of assessed need (difference between other income and minimum needs as estimated by an official formula) with the specific amount dependent upon the amount available to the State Department each month and the total number of recipients eligible to be served. The average monthly grant in Mississippi at the time the study was conducted was $35 per family unit, compared to $162 nationwide. Grants in Attala and Madison Counties in June, 1968, ranged from $5 to $82. Casework service normally involved periodic reviews to establish continued eligibility. These clients were not identified to their caseworkers as being part of the study. Their case records remained in the respective county welfare offices, and their cases remained under the supervision of the county welfare agents. Case records for clients in Groups II, III and IV on the other hand were located in the project office in Madison or its branch in Attala.

Group II: Title V Training and Income

The objective of the Title V program in Attala County was to provide the AFDC mothers with work experience and training, adult basic education and caseworker counseling and guidance in all areas connected with employability. Inputs included work orientation training, structured adult basic education, income supplements, selected services and increased caseworker contact.

Twenty-seven clients refused to participate in their group, and two others were found to be ineligible shortly after the program began. Most of those who refused gave ill health of themselves or other family members as a reason. Several indicated that they were not interested and a few said that they lacked transportation. The 31 clients who did participate did so for varying periods of time over the 12 month period. Twenty-six stayed in the program for the full 12 months or more. Two stayed for nine months before securing full-time employment. One became ineligible for AFDC after six months and was dropped from the program. Two others dropped out during the first six months.

A primary program output in Group II was work experience. The 31 participants worked a total of 24,236 hours in 56 job slots arranged by the project staff. The average number of hours spent on the job was 782. The number of jobs held by any one participant varied from one to three. Thirteen worked at one job, 11 at two jobs, and seven at three jobs during the program. Jobs were frequently geared to previous work experiences. Thirty-two positions were secured as housekeepers, cooks, and cafeteria workers in public schools and Head Start programs; two were secured in similar positions in other businesses. Four positions were as dental or

medical assistants. One client worked as a seamtress in an upholstery shop*.

A monthly evaluation of performance was submitted by the work supervisor of each trainee. The performance review consisted of ratings on four-point scales in eight areas: quality of work, quantity of work, dependability, attendance and punctuality, potentiality, initiative and drive, appearance, and attitude. Over time, there was a tendency for ratings on dependability to increase, a tendency for ratings on initiative and drive to decrease, and a tendency for other ratings to remain stable.

During the first five weeks of the program, Group II clients participated in 75 hours of orientation and training sessions led by project staff members and other welfare department workers. These sessions covered such topics as employer relationships, personal grooming, money and time management, citizenship, child care, health, safety, housekeeping, clothing, job retention and personal planning.

Incentive payments were used to insure that the clients received from the regular AFDC funds and from project funds an amount equal to 100 percent of their assessed budgetary deficiencies. In most instances, the supplemental funds were defined by the clients as "pay" for participating in the orientation, adult basic education, and on-the-job training activities. During the year a total of $34,436 in incentive payments was provided to the 31 clients. This represented an average monthly increase of $93 per client over the AFDC grant. In addition, $13,570 in project funds was spent to help cover child care, clothing and transportation costs associated with attending the training sessions and $1,418 was spent on medical and dental needs associated with work performance.

Adult basic education was mandatory for all clients in Groups II, III, and IV who did not have at least some high school education. Classes were first organized for Group II clients beginning in November, 1967, with 33 enrolled. During the session, there were 54 class periods of 3½ hours each. Forty class periods of three hours each were held in the spring of 1968 with 33 Group II clients enrolled. In addition, 32 class periods of three hours each were held in the fall of 1968, with 23 Group II clients enrolled. Groups III and IV participated only in the instructional periods held in the spring of 1968.**

During the spring classes, used as a frame for comparison among the three groups, Group II clients averaged 11.3 absences from the forty class meetings. Grade placement levels ranged from 1.8 to 5.3 at the

---

* There was a requirement in the Title V program that these jobs be in non-profit making organizations.

** Groups III and IV in Madison County were intended to participate also in adult basic education during the fall of 1968. The county school board, however, elected not to supply the necessary five percent matching funds to support the classes during the 1968-69 school year.

beginning of the class, and the average grade level increased by .2 to 3.5 over the forty periods.

During the year, 1,835 caseworker contacts with Group II clients were reported. These included 517 home visits by the caseworker, 349 office visits by the clients and 969 telephone contacts.

Group III: 1115 Special Services

The basic premise underlying the 1115 program undertaken in Madison County for Group III was that small caseloads would allow time for caseworker services of a more intensive and individualized nature. Attention was to be focused on problem areas and their solutions. One aim was to increase the client's awareness and utilization of community resources. Areas selected for concentration in the Madison County program were medical and dental care, meal planning, budgeting and other aspects of family life, and education of adults and children. The primary program element was a configuration of family-centered services and learning experiences. The mothers with no high school experience were also required to attend adult basic education classes during the spring of 1968.

Forty-six of the clients designated for Group III participated in the program. Two clients refused to participate without giving a reason, four indicated that they were not interested in the program, three said they did not want to attend the adult basic education classes, one left the county before the program began, and two were not contacted by the project staff for other reasons. Of the 46 participants, 43 were in the program for the full 12 months. One dropped out to accept full-time employment, and two moved from the county during the year. The minimum length of involvement was eight months.

Medical and dental services were provided to 45 adults and 169 children at a total cost of $11,439 during the 12 months. The largest sum, $5,050, was spent for corrective dental treatments for children. A total of $15,303 was spent for clothes, lunches, and supplies for school children. This included $2,135 to support participation in 4-H camp by 93 children.

Special classes aimed at improving and strengthening family life were conducted for Group III participants. Seven sessions of two hours each were focused on nutrition and meal planning. These were led by the county home economist and by the state supervisor of nutrition in the welfare department. Another session was led by a nurse and a dental hygenist. Others focused on banking and on safety in the home.

Forty-two clients in Group III were enrolled in adult basic education for 120 instructional hours during the spring of 1968. The average grade placement level increased by .2 for the group to 3.0 at the end of the forty class meetings. The average number of absences per person was 10.6 class meetings.

Caseworkers reported 1475 contacts with the clients in Group III over the year for an average of 32.0 contacts per client. Of this number, 835 were office visits by clients, 366 were group contacts, 141 were home visits by the caseworker, and 133 were telephone contacts.

Group IV: 1115 Income Only

The major program element in Group IV was increased financial assistance. The procedure used was to provide a supplemental monthly check from project funds to raise the level of assistance to 100 percent of the budgetary deficit. This group continued to receive the regular monthly AFDC grant based on a maximum of 27 percent. A total of $71,673 was expended to cover the difference between the regular grants and the budgetary deficits. This represented an average monthly increase of $124 per client of the regular AFDC grant.

The 48 participants in this group were with the program throughout the year. The other eight clients designated by the researchers as potential Group IV members were not contacted for various reasons.

Forty-six of the clients were enrolled in adult basic education* classes during the spring session. The average grade placement level of Group IV participants increased by .4 to 3.5 over the 40 class periods. The clients averaged 10.1 absences.

Caseworkers reported a total of 1,167 client contacts during the year, including 258 visits in clients' homes, 425 office visits by clients, 414 group contacts, and 70 telephone contacts.

Distinctions among the groups on program variables were reduced somewhat by a decision of the project staff to allow Group IV members to attend the special classes held for Group III members in Madison County. In addition, Group IV members were included in a few special sessions led by project staff members in which money management, budgeting and employment possibilities were discussed. While these were relatively minor inputs, their influence upon the findings must be considered.

Selected Comparisons

Table 2 shows the special financial inputs into the three program groups. These figures do not, of course, show the additional inputs of caseworker services, nor do they include the regular monthly AFDC grants received by clients in all four groups. On a per capita basis, the financial inputs considered in the table were about equal for Groups II and IV. Group III received somewhat less than one-half as much as either of these.

---

* State law requires that special training activities be associated with any increase in welfare payments over the maximum of 27 percent of budgetary deficit.

Table 2. Financial inputs to client groups

Input	Group I Control Group (N=56)	Group II Training & Income (N=31)	Group III Special Services (N=46)	Group IV Income Only (N=48)
General				
Support	-	$34,436	-	$71,673
Transportation	-	11,935	$5,640	4,185
Child Care	-	1,304	1,237	399
Adult Clothing	-	331	1,363	1,235
Total	-	$48,006	$8,240	$77,492
Medical				
Exam (adult)	-	$ 265	$ 155	-
Treatment (adult)	-	1,153	716	-
Exam (child)	-	-	1,590	-
Treatment (child)	-	-	3,928	-
Dental (child)	-	-	5,050	-
Total	-	$ 1,418	$11,439	-
School				
Clothes	-	-	$ 4,249	-
Lunches	-	-	8,095	-
Supplies	-	-	823	-
Total	-	-	$13,167	-
4-H				
Clothes	-	-	$1,192	-
Transportation	-	-	171	-
Dues	-	-	772	-
Total	-	-	$2,135	-
Total	-	$49,424	$34,982	$77,492
Per client	-	$1,594	$760	$1,614

It will be recalled that increased intensity of caseworker services was to be a distinctive aspect of the program for Group III. While the data reveal nothing about the quality of contacts or the nature of interpersonal relationships, it would appear that in actual operation the clients in Group III received less personal attention than those in Group II. Apart from group meetings, the caseworkers reported totals of 1,835, 1,109 and 753 contacts with clients in Groups II, III and IV, respectively. When telephone contacts are omitted from the totals leaving only home and office visits, the numbers of contacts are reduced to 866, 976 and

683, respectively. The average number of face-to-face, individual contacts per client was 27.9 in Group II, 21.2 in Group III and 14.2 in Group IV. Mode of operation of the programs is also revealed by the fact that clients were visited in their homes an average of 16.7 times each by the caseworker in Group II as compared to 3.1 times in Group III and 5.4 times in Group IV. Office visits by the client were more frequent in Group III with an average of 18.2 compared to 11.3 in Group II and 8.9 in Group IV.

Tables 3 and 4 summarize responses of the clients to questions asked in the follow-up survey about caseworker contacts and about reactions to the programs. The percent figures in Table 3 and the results of the statistical tests (based on cross tabulations of frequency distributions) show two things in a very general way. First, these data* suggest that participation in a program tended to heighten the clients' awareness and approval of the caseworker as well as their contact with the caseworker. On most items, the major difference was between the control group on the one hand and the three program groups on the other. Second, these data reveal important differences among the three program groups. Group II was most consistently different from the control group and was followed closely in this regard by Group IV.

Overall, Group III differed from the control group less than did the other two program groups. This pattern was striking and ironic on several items for which the program inputs were designed to bring about more dramatic changes in Group III than in Groups II and IV. The greater frequency of caseworker contact in Group III is reflected in the larger percentage of clients in this group who reported having seen the caseworker at least once a month. But the clients in this group were less likely than those in the other groups to recall having talked with their caseworker about money management, child care, employment, housing and health -- the areas of emphasis in the Group III program.

Table 4 shows that in all three program groups most of the clients felt that the program had made at least some difference in each of four important areas of their lives. Overall, there was more of a tendency for Group II respondents to regard the program as having made a great difference. The consistency of the distributions on the four items among the Group II clients suggest that a strong mental set regarding the program was in operation.

Limitations and Strengths

The data on actual operation of the program variables indicate clearly that the study should be regarded as no more than an approximation of the strict comparison of program effects which is needed. The strength of the design was lessened by a number of factors. Groups II, III and IV, for example, all participated in adult basic education classes, and clients in Group IV participated in some activities designed for Group III. Caseworker contacts in Group III appear to have been less intense than anticipated in the design. Financial inputs per

---

* Group IV was significantly low on ability to correctly identify caseworker. This may have been influenced by sudden changes in project staff on two occasions.

Table 3. Clients' observations about caseworkers after one year of program operation

Item	Group I Control Group (N=56)	Group II Training & Income (N=31)	Group III Special Services (N=46)	Group IV Income Only (N=48)
	Percent			
Named principal caseworker	74.9	87.0	71.7	2.1
Feels caseworker does a good job	83.8	96.7*	100.0*	93.7*
Feels caseworker enjoys working with family very much	67.8	93.5	80.4	81.2
Sees caseworker once a month or more	16.1	25.8*	32.1*	33.5
Home visits last over half an hour	26.7	61.3*	26.0	24.9*
Caseworker talks with you about:				
Managing money	39.2	83.8*	63.0	91.6*
Child care	73.	80.6	71.7	91.6
Employment	53.5	96.7*	56.5	72.9
Housing	27.6	70.9	49.9	64.5*
Health	58.9	87.0*	80.4	83.3

*The difference between this group and the control group on this variable was found to be significant by the two-tailed chi square test at the .05 level of probability. The test was computed on the complete distributions rather than on the summary percents shown in the table. The procedure is described in Chapter II.

client were less in Group III than in Groups II and IV. Recruitment of clients into Group II was a severe problem. Location of the Title V and 1115 components in separate counties, which was necessary for administrative reasons, made strict randomization of case assignments impossible. The number of clients in each group was too small to allow for meaningful intragroup comparisons on program outputs. The relatively short period

Table 4. Clients' reactions to programs

What Difference Has the Program Made:	Group II Training & Income (N=31)	Group III Special Services (N=46)	Group IV Income Only (N=48)
	- - - - - Percent - - - - -		
In providing for your children			
Great difference	80.7	86.9	79.2
Some difference	12.9	8.7	20.8
No difference	-	-	-
No answer	6.4	4.4	-
	100.0	100.0	100.0
In preparing you for a job			
Great difference	80.7	36.9	29.2
Some difference	12.9	41.3	54.2
No difference	-	17.4	16.6
No answer	6.4	4.4	-
	100.0	100.0	100.0
In helping you earn a better living			
Great difference	80.7	45.6	41.7
Some difference	12.9	43.4	52.1
No difference	-	6.6	6.2
No answer	6.4	4.4	-
	100.0	100.0	100.0
In promoting your self-respect and confidence			
Great difference	80.7	69.5	60.5
Some difference	12.9	21.7	39.5
No difference	-	4.4	-
No answer	6.4	4.4	-
	100.0	100.0	100.0

of time between measurements and the timing of the second measurement during rather than after the program period limit the degree to which conclusions may be drawn about changes.

These limiting factors stem in part from the very conditions which give the study its basic strength and relevance. It was, first, a field study with all the complications and confusions inherent in investigation of social and social-psychological changes under relatively uncontrolled

conditions. Second, the overall design included an attempt to impose a degree of experimental control over these conditions. The level of success of this effort, while meager by the standards of laboratory experimentation, was relatively great for a study in a field setting. Third, the study involved a coordinated effort in research and action, the objectives and priorities of which frequently differ.

CHAPTER II

FINDINGS

Overview

Data from the before and follow-up surveys are presented in this chapter in three sections. The sections comprise convenient groupings of indicators rather than sharply differentiated conceptual dimensions of the problem. First to be treated are changes over the one-year period in financial status. Data are then presented on changes in the styles of living adopted by the clients and their families. The third section deals with changes in personal outlook or orientations of the clients. In each section, the emphasis is on changes which may be related to the program variables.

The data shown in this chapter are in most cases highly abbreviated summaries in percent form. These are shown rather than the complete distributions, which are presented in appendix tables,* to preserve perspective and, hopefully, readability in reporting the large number of variables included in the study. The summary percents were selected to indicate the major directions of change and, in most cases, the extent of change from Time #1 to Time #2. Where appropriate, the selected percents indicate the extent of change in what is assumed to be a "positive" direction as regards potential for upward social mobility.

Approximation of an experimental design required that different patterns of change among the program groups and differences at Time #2 be assessed relative to changes and Time #2 characteristics of the control group. The control group was assumed to reflect characteristics of the general population of AFDC clients in the rural South. The analytical plan, based on the experimental model of the "before-after design with one control group," called for two types of measures of the significance of differences among the change variables. The first would involve an overall comparison to determine whether changes in the program groups (Groups II, III and IV) differed significantly from changes in the control group (Group I). In the classical experiment, this step is used to verify that the experimental "treatments" have had some effect. The second step would be to compare the control group changes with changes in each of the program groups, taken individually, on each of the variables on which a significant difference had been found at the first step.

The first operational step consisted of making an assumption, arbitrarily where necessary but on the basis of logic and previous studies in most cases, as to which direction of change on each variable should be regarded as "positive." Clients were then classified according to whether their responses changed between Time #1 and Time #2 in a

---

*These tables are available on request from the Social Science Research Center, Mississippi State University, P. O. Box 5287, State College, Mississippi 39762.

positive direction, in a negative direction or not at all. Change was defined liberally* to include any shift among code categories. On some dichotomous variables, e.g. employed--not employed, it was possible also to break the "no change" category into "remained positive" and "remained negative" subgroupings. A difference of proportions test was then calculated for each variable. The test was found to be significant in only a few cases. Those variables on which a significant difference at the .05 level was found are indicated in the appendix tables.

Then, recognizing that this study was only an approximation of an experiment, a decision was made to conduct the second test, i.e. comparing each program group individually with the control group, on all variables rather than only on the few for which a significant difference of proportions ratio had been found in the first step. The two-tailed chi square test was used for this purpose with the changes classified as indicated above. Asterisks are used in the tables in the text to indicate those cases in which the difference between change in a program group and change in the control group was significant by this test at the .05 level. In addition, asterisks in the text tables indicate cases in which a program group differed significantly from the control group on a variable measured only at Time #2.** Absence of an asterisk means, unless otherwise indicated, that the chi square was not significant.

Financial Status

The first grouping of measures treated in the report are those which indicate immediate changes in economic condition of the family. Included are changes in employment status, sources and amounts of income and expenditure patterns. Had the follow-up measures been taken at some interval after termination of the programs, these changes might be seen as important "outcome" variables. After only one year of program operation, however, these changes are more appropriately regarded as "output" variables. They might in a few instances point to changes in long-term trends.

The most substantial changes in employment status occurred, as might have been expected, in Group II, the work experience and training group. Largely no doubt as the result of the caseworker's efforts in locating jobs, the increase in employment in this group as shown in Table 5, was from 22.6% before the program began to 90.3% after one year. This greatly exceeded the slight increase in the control group and contrasted sharply with negative changes in the other two groups. Whether the heightened employment experience of Group II members will have the desired long-range effect on motivations and abilities to secure and hold a job on one's own initiative remains, of course, an unanswered question. The

---

*A liberal measure of change was used because of the expectation that major changes would be rare over the one-year period.

**"After-only" analysis such as this is, strictly speaking, appropriate only when there has been random assignment of cases among groups. The test results are thus suggestive rather than conclusive.

data in this case indicate at least that the Group II members, if not the members of the other groups, were subjected to the experience of a regular job. As shown by the other items in Table 5, this, in most cases, was a position in at least a semi-skilled occupation. In all but a few cases, the new jobs for Group II members paid more than 50¢ an hour -- the going rate for domestic day work in the community.

Negative changes in the percent employed at the time of the interview (which is certainly a limited time sample) occurred in Groups III and IV and in percent earning over 50¢ per hour in Group IV. This change in Group IV differed from that in the control group at a statistically significant level despite the small absolute number of clients who actually experienced a change in rate of pay. There was a tendency, shown here over the short run, for clients to drop out of employment status when their minimum needs were met through the special welfare programs. Whether this reflects a fundamental consequence of such program inputs is not clear from the data available.

Contrasted with the data on employment and hourly wages is the finding of increased job-seeking activities among clients in Groups III and IV. What seems more likely than a lessening of the will to work in response to the increased level of welfare support is that the clients in Groups III and IV tended to reject the menial, low-paying jobs to which they had been accustomed and turned their attention instead to the search for more remunerative employment. The data in this regard seem to reflect more of a temporary response to release from frustrating underemployment than to work as such.

There was also, as noted in Table 5, a general decrease in all groups in the percentage of clients with no health barriers to employment. Whether this reflects the effects of aging aggravated by the cumulative deprivations of poverty or some other cause is open to speculation as is the greater negative change in Group II than in the other groups. Perhaps the most important statistic among these is that about one-half of all the clients perceived of themselves as having some health problem of such severity as to retard or prevent their assumption of an independent occupational status.

Changes in sources of family income over the one-year period are shown in Table 6. In all except Group IV, the percentage receiving some form of public welfare support dropped slightly during the year from the 100% level which had been the case for all four groups at Time #1. In some instances, especially in Group I, the control group, this was the result of the family's becoming ineligible for welfare support for reasons other than increased economic assets. The fact thall all members of Group IV continued on welfare throughout the year must be interpreted in light of the fact that this was the case for about 90% of all the clients in the study. The table also shows that for all groups except Group IV there was an increase over the year in the percent with some earned income during the month preceeding the interview, and that for all groups, including Group IV, there was an increase in the percent with income from sources other than public welfare or wages (from gifts, for example).

Table 5. Changes in employment status

Indicators	Group I Control Group (N=56)	Group II Training & Income (N=31)	Group III Special Services (N=46)	Group IV Income Only (N=48)
Percent employed				
Time #1	33.9	22.6	41.3	29.2
Time #2	37.5	90.3	30.4	8.3
Change	3.6	67.7*	-10.9	-20.9*
Percent with semi-skilled or higher status jobs				
Time #1	3.6	3.2	2.2	2.1
Time #2	14.3	87.1	4.3	4.2
Change	10.7	83.9*	2.1	2.1
Percent earning over 50¢ per hour (on last job)				
Time #1	16.1	16.1	15.2	33.3
Time #2	21.4	67.7	21.7	2.1
Change	5.3	51.6*	6.5	-31.2*
Percent seeking a job anytime during past year				
Time #1	26.8	32.3	30.4	33.3
Time #2	28.6	6.5	52.2	60.4
Change	1.8	-25.8*	21.8	27.1
Percent without health barriers to full employment				
Time #1	55.4	38.7	60.9	62.5
Time #2	46.4	22.6	50.0	54.2
Change	- 9.0	-16.1*	-10.9	- 8.3

*Chi square significant. See Footnote, Table 3.

While the differences were statistically significant in only a few cases, the pattern of differences across the several measures of employment status and sources of family income seems to suggest tentative conclusions as follows: (1) The general tendency in the client population, as indicated by the control group and by changes common to the four groups, was toward a slight increase in the proportion employed and having earned income. (2) There were changes in the program groups

Table 6. Changes in sources of family income

Indicators	Group I Control Group (N=56)	Group II Training & Income (N=31)	Group III Special Services (N=46)	Group IV Income Only (N=48)
Percent receiving public assistance in previous month				
Time #1	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Time #2	83.9	90.3	91.3	100.0
Change	- 16.1	- 9.7	- 8.7	--
Percent who use food stamps				
Time #1	64.3	67.7	78.3	52.1
Time #2	60.7	58.0	76.1	56.2
Change	- 3.6	- 9.7	- 2.2	4.1
Percent with income from earnings in previous month				
Time #1	23.2	22.6	26.1	18.7
Time #2	33.9	48.4	34.8	12.5
Change	10.7	25.8	8.7	- 6.2*
Percent earning $30 or more in previous month				
Time #1	7.1	12.9	4.3	10.4
Time #2	23.2	45.2	23.9	6.2
Change	16.1	32.3	19.6	- 4.2*
Percent with income other than wages or welfare in previous month				
Time #1	----	3.2	----	----
Time #2	5.4	16.1	21.7	20.8
Change	5.4	12.9	21.7	20.8
Percent with $30 or more from other sources				
Time #1	----	3.2	----	----
Time #2	19.6	16.1	15.2	20.8
Change	19.6	12.9	15.2	20.8

*Chi square significant. See Footnote, Table 3.

consistent with program inputs, e.g. most Group II members acquired semi-skilled or higher status jobs, and a number of Group IV members left low-paying jobs. It would appear that the programs in Group II and Group IV had greater impact on the financial status of families than did the program in Group III. (3) In absolute terms, the economic status of all four groups remained very low despite the changes which occurred. Relative to changes occurring in middle-class society during the same period, the changes in these client groups were meager; so meager in fact that they probably represent a decrease in relative status.

Data on family income based on reports by respondents are subject to numerous sources of error and bias and should be considered in the study of program-induced changes in only a limited way. Further, with exception of the last two items on monthly income, the data in Table 7, refer to differences between incomes in 1966 and 1967 - the "previous" calendar years.* Only the last two months of 1967 were included in the program year. The consistency among the groups on the annual income items may be taken as additional evidence that the groups started the program year from similar financial bases. According to their reports at Time #1 and Time #2, their incomes had been rising slowly over the previous year to an average level of about $100 per month at the time of the first interview.

The contrast between the third and fourth items in Table 7 is striking. The third item is based upon an objective comparison of the respondents' reports at Time #1 and Time #2. The fourth item refers to the respondents' general recollections as to whether their incomes had changed during the period. The substantial and statistically significant differences in Groups II and IV on the latter measure indicate that program inputs had great influence on recall.

The last two items in Table 7 reflect program inputs even more clearly. There was a significant increase in median welfare income (excluding the program grants) in the month before the interviews in all three program groups. The level of statistical significance was due in part to the decrease in welfare income in the control group matched against a slight increase in each of the program groups. The final item in the table is total income from all sources, including the program grants, during the month preceeding the second interview. Consistent with the program inputs, the median total amounts received by families in Groups II and IV were more than double the amounts received in Groups I and III. These figures refer only to cash income.

---

*There is, of course, no assurance that the clients restricted their answers to these periods. More likely, their estimates were colored by their more recent experiences.

Table 7. Changes in amounts of family income

Indicators	Group I Control Group (N=56)	Group II Training & Income (N=31)	Group III Special Services (N=46)	Group IV Income Only (N=48)
Median income in previous year				
Time #1	$ 750	$ 1,035	$ 1,000	$ 846
Time #2	1,205	1,205	1,175	1,270
Change	$ 455	$ 170	$ 175	$ 424
Percent with over $1,000 income in previous year				
Time #1	17.9	29.0	15.2	12.5
Time #2	21.4	29.0	21.7	25.0
Change	3.5	-	6.5	12.5
Percent whose reported annual income:				
Increased, T^1-T^2	57.0	48.0	46.0	65.0
Decreased, T^1-T^2	13.0	29.0	17.0	10.0
Did not change	30.0	23.0	37.0	25.0
Percent who thought their annual income:				
Increased, T^1-T^2	24.9	80.6*	41.2	79.2*
Decreased, T^1-T^2	26.8	6.5	19.6	10.4
Did not change	48.2	12.9	39.1	10.4
Median welfare income in previous month				
Time #1	$ 43	$ 33	$ 45	$ 37
Time #2	40	50	50	40
Change	$ - 3	$ 17*	$ 5*	$ 3*
Median total income in previous month				
Time #2	$ 73	$ 190*	$ 82	$ 177*

*Chi square significant. See Footnote, Table 3.

The items in Table 8 refer to changes between Time #1 and Time #2--the "past year" -- as seen by the clients in the amounts of money they had with which to meet their needs. The overall tendency in the study

Table 8. Clients' perceptions of changes during the year in amounts of money available to them to meet their needs

Needs	Group I Control Group (N=56)	Group II Training & Income (N=31)	Group III Special Services (N=46)	Group IV Income Only (N=48)
		- - - - Percents - - - -		
Food				
More money	21.4	77.4*	36.9	81.2*
Less money	30.4	9.7	28.3	6.3
No change	48.2	12.9	34.8	12.5
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Clothing				
More money	16.1	70.9*	47.8*	67.7*
Less money	32.1	9.8	26.1	10.4
No change	51.8	19.3	26.1	22.9
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Housing				
More money	14.3	54.8*	17.4	66.7*
Less money	26.8	6.5	26.1	10.4
No change	58.9	38.7	56.5	22.9
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Furniture and appliances				
More money	8.9	61.3*	8.7	54.2*
Less money	32.2	6.5	28.3	10.4
No change	58.9	32.2	63.0	35.4
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Child support				
More money	17.9	67.7*	39.2	79.2*
Less money	30.3	9.7	23.9	12.5
No change	51.8	22.6	36.9	8.3
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Medical and dental care				
More money	10.7	61.3*	52.2*	74.9*
Less money	37.5	9.7	15.2	10.5
No change	51.8	29.0	32.6	14.6
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Entertainment				
More money	10.7	41.9*	13.1	33.3*
Less money	42.9	16.2	34.8	16.7
No change	46.4	41.9	52.1	50.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

*Chi square significant. See Footnote, Table 3.

population was toward perceiving a decrease in amounts available to meet the various needs. This is in contrast to recollections about total amounts of income, which were seen generally as increasing slightly. What this suggests is that the clients saw their basic expenses as increasing much faster than their incomes. There is little basis for doubting that this was a realistic set of perceptions.

Groups II and IV differed significantly from the control group on all items covered in Table 8. In each case, a substantial proportion of the clients in these groups saw themselves as having more money available than previously. In Group III significant differences from the control group were noted on only two items, clothing and medical-dental care. These were items which received special attention in the 1115 program for Group III. On a number of the other items, Group III responses were similar to those of the control group.

Changes in financial status are also indicated by the pattern of expenditures of family income. Respondents during both interviews were asked to indicate the amounts they spent for each of several purposes during the previous month. In each instance, the question was geared to answers given to previously asked questions about sources and amounts of income. Tables 9 and 10 show the results, expressed first in terms of dollars spent and then in terms of percents of the total income allotted to the various purposes.

Much of the increased income reported by clients in Groups II and IV apparently went to meet food needs. The percent spending $40 or more for food in the previous month increased substantially in these groups while it remained constant in the control group and decreased by nearly one-third in Group III. This was despite an increase in Group III in the average percent of income spent for food. A somewhat similar pattern held for expenditures for housing and utilities. In fact, on virtually all items the percentage of clients in Group III spending the indicated amounts during the previous month decreased over the year. In Groups II and IV, which received additional funds, there were increases in the percents spending the indicated amounts on a number of items.

The data in Table 10 indicate (1) that there were no dramatic shifts among percent allocations for the four categories of uses which were considered, (2) that the modest changes which did occur were generally as would be expected in light of the different program inputs, and (3) that similarities were more prominent than differences among the four groups of clients at both time periods.

One additional item in this regard has to do with changes in the level of indebtedness of the clients. The data are shown in Table 11. Although not statistically significant, there were interesting differences among the three program groups relative to the control group in percentage changes over time. Group II was the only one with an increase in the percent owing as much as $25, although there were increases in other groups in the percent making payments on appliances and furniture. In so far as the data are complete and reliable in this regard, they indicate that only in Group II was there a notable increase in willingness

Table 9. Changes in expenditures for selected items

Expenditures	Group I Control Group (N=56)	Group II Training & Income (N=31)	Group III Special Services (N=46)	Group IV Income Only (N=48)
Percent spending $40 or more in previous month for:				
Food				
Time #1	51.8	51.6	78.3	52.1
Time #2	51.8	80.6	54.3	87.5
Change	-	29.0*	-24.0	35.4*
Percent spending $20 or more in previous month for:				
Rent				
Time #1	17.9	19.4	36.9	35.4
Time #2	14.3	19.4	21.7	39.6
Change	- 3.6	-	-15.2	4.2*
Percent spending $10 or more in previous month for:				
Utilities				
Time #1	50.0	80.6	52.2	50.0
Time #2	28.6	51.6	45.7	47.9
Change	-21.4	-29.0	- 6.5*	- 2.1
Medical treatment				
Time #1	17.9	32.3	23.9	35.4
Time #2	3.6	32.3	6.5	37.5
Change	-14.3	- *	-17.4	2.1*
Drugs				
Time #1	35.5	16.1	28.3	25.0
Time #2	16.1	19.4	4.3	16.7
Change	-19.4	3.3	- 24.0	- 8.3
Dental treatment				
Time #1	1.8	3.2	2.2	8.3
Time #2	-	6.4	2.2	6.2
Change	- 1.8	3.2	-	- 2.1
Clothing				
Time #1	57.1	41.9	60.9	68.7
Time #2	46.4	48.4	36.9	85.4
Change	-10.7	6.5	-24.0	16.7*

Table 9. Continued

Expenditures	Group I Control Group (N=56)	Group II Training & Income (N=31)	Group III Special Services (N=46)	Group IV Income Only (N=48)
Children				
Time #1	37.5	41.9	56.5	54.2
Time #2	19.6	32.3	32.6	43.7
Change	-17.9	- 9.6	-23.9	-10.5
Recreation				
Time #1	-	3.2	-	-
Time #2	1.8	-	-	-
Change	1.8	- 3.2	-	-
Car or truck				
Time #1	8.9	6.5	-	-
Time #2	7.1	16.1	4.3	4.2
Change	- 1.8	9.6	4.3	4.2
Other				
Time #1	8.9	3.2	21.7	22.9
Time #2	3.6	6.5	2.2	6.2
Change	- 5.3	3.3	-19.5	-16.7

*Chi square significant. See Footnote, Table 3.

to go into debt. These data along with the other measures of financial status and outlook show that Group II members moreso than the others tended to conceive of themselves as being in improved circumstances.

Life Style

Changes in the "life styles" of the clients constitute a second dimension of the problem of social mobility of the welfare poor. Minute changes in the way people live and conduct their everyday affairs might, if positively reinfoced and supported by forces and conditions in the community and society, signal at least a start toward self-sufficiency and actualization of individual potentials. Measures were taken at both time periods of several aspects of life style. In addition, selected measures of changes during the year were included in the Time #2 survey. The data presented below supplement those presented earlier on family financial status, which is also, of course, an aspect of life style. The focus here, however, is less upon the immediate improvement in economic well-being than upon changes in potential for future upward mobility.

Table 10. Change in percent of income in previous month spent for selected items

Expenditures in Previous Month	Group I Control Group (N=56)	Group II Training & Income (N=31)	Group III Special Services (N=46)	Group IV Income Only (N=48)
	- - - Average Percent Spent - - -			
Food				
Time #1	51.2	52.7	46.2	42.4
Time #2	53.1	55.5	52.3	45.0
Change	1.9	2.8	6.1	2.6
Housing & utilities				
Time #1	15.5	24.5	18.5	13.8
Time #2	19.5	19.1	23.6	16.5
Change	4.0	- 5.4	5.1	2.7
Clothing				
Time #1	20.2	12.3	21.0	21.1
Time #2	15.5	10.5	13.8	21.6
Change	- 4.7	- 1.8	- 7.2	.5
Medical treatment				
Time #1	9.3	8.2	8.5	12.3
Time #2	8.1	7.3	7.8	10.4
Change	- 1.2	- .9	- .7	- 1.9

Table 11. Changes in indebtedness

Indicators	Group I Control Group (N=56)	Group II Training & Income (N=31)	Group III Special Services (N=46)	Group IV Income Only (N=48)
Percent in debt $25 or more:				
Time #1	41.1	32.3	47.8	35.4
Time #2	10.7	51.6	23.9	25.0
Change	-30.4	19.3	-23.9	-10.4
Percent making monthly payments on:				
Appliances				
Time #1	10.7	16.1	15.2	8.3
Time #2	26.7	16.1	13.0	24.9
Change	16.0	-	- 2.2	16.6
Furniture				
Time #1	10.7	-	15.2	22.9
Time #2	14.2	9.6	17.3	22.9
Change	3.5	9.6	2.1	-

Changes in selected indicators of housing status are shown in Table 12. The tendency across these indicators was for the housing status of clients in Group II to improve more than in other groups. The significant decrease in the percent in this group living in newer houses (those built since World War II) probably reflects a county difference in predominant types of housing available. As noted earlier, Attala County, in which the Title V program for Group II was located, was much less urbanized that Madison. Most new housing construction in Mississippi during the past quarter century has been in the more urbanized areas.

Table 12. Changes in housing status

Indicators	Group I Control Group (N=56)	Group II Training & Income (N=31)	Group III Special Services (N=46)	Group IV Income Only (N=48)
Percent who own their homes				
Time #1	17.9	19.4	8.7	8.3
Time #2	12.5	29.0	10.9	6.2
Change	- 5.4	9.6*	2.2	- 2.1
Median number of persons in household				
Time #1	6.0	5.6	6.6	6.5
Time #2	5.8	4.8	6.4	6.1
Change	- .2	- .8	- .2	- .4
Percent in houses built since WW II				
Time #1	30.4	35.5	26.1	39.6
Time #2	46.4	25.8	45.7	52.1
Change	16.0	- 9.7*	19.6	12.5
Percent in houses rated as "clean" by interviewer				
Time #1	71.4	61.3	71.7	81.2
Time #2	64.3	83.9	65.2	70.8
Change	- 7.1	22.6	- 6.5	-10.4
Percent with yards rated as "neat" by interviewer				
Time #1	57.1	51.6	78.3	75.0
Time #2	71.4	74.2	69.5	62.5
Change	14.3	22.6	- 8.8*	-12.5

*Chi square significant. See Footnote, Table 3.

Cleanliness of the house and neatness of the yard have been shown to be highly predictive within low-income groups of a family's prestige

in the eyes of others in the community and in their own self images.[1] This can be the case despite the subjectivity involved in having the ranking done by a nonprofessional interviewer. The increase in the percent in Group II who received ratings of "clean" and "neat" for the house and yard respectively, stands in contrast with the decreases in Groups III and IV. These data imply that Group II members increased their level of concern more than did the others with the quality of their surroundings.

The measures presented in Table 13 have to do with what might be called the family's level of living or level of consumption. Respondents were asked at both time periods whether or not they had each of 21 household items or conveniences. Having or not having these items is in part indicative of the level of economic resources available to the family; but it is also indicative of patterns of family life and, in some cases, of values. Item analysis (Guttman sealing technique) was used to reduce the 21 items to 13 among which there was a consistent, cumulative relationship at both time periods. Table 13 shows changes in the percents having each of these items and in the percents scoring six or above on the 13-item scale.

The changes, in general, were slight and were not statistically significant. Most changes were positive; although in Group III, there was a decrease in the percent of clients scoring six or above on the composite scale. The greatest increase overall was in Group IV, but this was almost matched by the change in the control group. Most clients in all groups had electricity, a refrigerator and a stove. Fewer had piped water, an inside toilet, a sink, a freezer or the other items in the scale. The level of living of families remained low in all groups.

Food consumption patterns, which are treated in Tables 14 and 15, are an important aspect of the family's style of life. Table 14 shows responses to a question as to the frequency with which eggs, meat, fruit and milk are included in the family diet. No consistent pattern of differences among the groups was found after the operation of the special programs for one year, although foods in each category appeared to be eaten slightly more frequently by members of the program groups than by members of the control group. A greater percentage of the control group members reported that their families ate the selected foods less than once a week if ever. Fruit was consumed with less frequency than the other foods considered in this table.

A somewhat more specific and exhaustive measure was used to generate the data shown in Table 15. Clients were asked to list all foods which had been eaten by the family during each of the previous two days. The items listed were then classified according to the scheme shown in the table. Foods in the bread, meat and vegetable groups had been eaten during the previous two days by nearly all the families, irregardless of group. Foods in the milk and potato grouping were less frequently eaten,

---

[1] See Jerry W. Robinson, Residential Stratification in Old City: Its Substantive Meaning and Predictive Utility, Ph.D. Dissertation, Mississippi State University, August 1966.

Table 13. Changes in percent possessing selected household items

Items	Group I Control Group (N=56)	Group II Training & Income (N=31)	Group III Special Services (N=46)	Group IV Income Only (N=48)
		- - - Percent Possessing - - -		
Electricity				
Time #1	85.7	90.3	78.3	79.2
Time #2	91.1	93.5	91.3	87.5
Change	5.4	3.2	13.0	8.3
Refrigerator				
Time #1	67.9	80.6	71.7	79.2
Time #280.4	80.4	90.3	69.5	85.4
Change	12.5	9.7	- 2.2	6.2
Stove				
Time #1	66.0	80.6	60.9	54.2
Time #2	75.0	93.5	67.4	62.5
Change	9.0	12.9	6.5	8.3
Piped water				
Time #1	26.8	25.8	28.3	33.3
Time #2	23.2	41.9	34.8	43.7
Change	- 3.6	16.1	6.5	10.4
Inside toilet				
Time #1	30.4	25.8	21.7	25.0
Time #2	25.0	29.0	19.6	27.1
Change	-5.4	3.2	- 2.1	2.1
Kitchen sink				
Time #1	23.2	12.9	23.9	25.0
Time #2	21.4	22.6	19.6	29.1
Change	- 1.8	9.7	- 4.3	4.1
Freezer				
Time #1	25.0	32.3	21.7	12.5
Time #2	32.1	41.9	26.1	12.5
Change	7.1	9.6	4.4	-
Telephone				
Time #1	14.3	38.7	10.9	-
Time #2	21.4	48.4	23.9	6.2
Change	7.1	9.7	13.0	6.2
Newspaper (weekly)				
Time #1	19.6	16.1	15.2	12.5
Time #2	12.5	16.1	8.7	16.7
Change	- 7.1	-	- 6.5	4.2

Table 13. Continued

Items	Group I Control Group (N=56)	Group II Training & Income (N=31)	Group III Special Services (N=46)	Group IV Income Only (N=48)
Bath or shower				
Time #1	10.7	9.7	13.0	12.5
Time #2	8.9	16.1	10.9	12.5
Change	- 1.8	6.4	- 2.1	-
Running hot water				
Time #1	7.1	9.7	10.9	12.5
Time #2	5.4	16.1	10.9	12.5
Change	- 1.7	6.4	-	-
Magazines (other than women's or farm)				
Time #1	12.5	9.7	8.7	2.1
Time #2	1.8	9.7	2.2	12.5
Change	-10.7	-	- 6.5	10.4*
Pick-up truck				
Time #1	8.9	-	2.2	4.2
Time #2	7.1	9.7	-	2.1
Change	- 1.8	9.7	- 2.2	- 2.1
Scores high on level of living scale**				
Time #1	19.6	16.1	23.9	18.7
Time #2	37.4	25.8	15.2	37.4
Change	17.8	9.7	- 8.7	18.7

* Chi square significant. See Footnote, Table 3.

** Scale scores 6 and above on scale formed by the 13 items above. Coefficient of Reproducibility: T^1=0.92; T^2=0.93.

and those in butter and fruit grouping were eaten by very few families. The percent in Group III eating foods in at least five of the seven categories was greater than in the other groups, but this group was not different from the control group at a statistically significant level.

Thus there is no clear evidence that program participation significantly altered family eating patterns. In addition to the data in Tables 14 and 15, no significant differences were found in the Time #2 survey in number of family meals per day, frequency of grocery shopping or percentage of families in which school children had lunch each day.

Table 14. Frequency with which selected foods are eaten by the family

Foods and Frequency*	Group I Control Group (N=56)	Group II Training & Income (N=31)	Group III Special Services (N=46)	Group IV Income Only (N=48)
	- - - Percent Eating - - -			
Eggs				
Daily	46.4	48.4	58.7	56.2
At least once a week	30.4	45.2	34.7	39.6
Less than once a week	14.3	3.2	4.4	2.1
Seldom or never	8.9	3.2	2.2	2.1
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Meat				
Daily	58.9	70.9	67.4	68.8
At least once a week	32.1	16.2	28.2	24.9
Less than once a week	5.4	9.7	2.2	2.1
Seldom or never	3.6	3.2	2.2	4.2
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Fruit				
Daily	28.6	16.1	8.7	24.9
At least once a week	33.9	67.7	63.0	52.2
Less than once a week	19.6	9.7	19.6	10.4
Seldom or never	17.9	6.5	8.7	12.5
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Milk				
Daily	57.1	58.0	58.6	72.9
At least once a week	16.1	29.0	32.6	22.9
Less than once a week	17.9	6.5	4.4	2.1
Seldom or never	8.9	6.5	4.4	2.1
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

*Time #2 only. Chi squares not calculated. Frequencies are non-cumulative.

All clients reported that their families ate either two or three meals a day. Those eating three rather than two included 43% of the control group, 45% of Group II, 59% of Group III and 60% of Group IV. Groceries were purchased at least once a week by 48% of Group I, 65% of Group II, 46% of Group III and 44% of Group IV. Only 13 clients reported that their school children did not eat lunch regularly. Nine of these were in Group I, three were in Group II, and one was in Group IV.

Use of medical and dental services and prevalence of untreated health problems is another area of life style which is frequently considered in studies of social rank and mobility. Table 16 shows responses to questions asked in the Time #2 survey about medical and dental treatment received during the previous year. As expected, Group III, which received medical and dental services for mother and children as a major program input, had the greatest percent reporting use of these services

Table 15. Percent whose families had selected foods during previous two days

Foods*	Group I Control Group (N=56)	Group II Training & Income (N=31)	Group III Special Services (N=46)	Group IV Income Only (N=48)
	- - - Percent Eating - - -			
A. Bread, flour, cereals: oatmeal, grits, bread products, sweets, rice, macaroni	100.0	100.0	97.8	95.8
B. Meat, poultry, fish, eggs, meat substitutes: cheese, nuts, peanut butter, dried vegetables, pork and beans	100.0	96.8	100.0	97.9
C. Milk and milk products, desserts, pudding, ice cream	60.7	67.7	76.1	74.9
D. Butter and margarine	16.1	6.5	10.9	12.5
E. Vegetables (deep green and yellow): greens, spinach, broccoli, green beans, carrots, squash, pumpkin	87.5	90.3	80.4	89.6
F. Fruits (citrus) and tomatoes	14.3	29.0	26.1	24.9
G. Potatoes, other vegetables and other fruits	69.6	51.6	63.0	47.9
Five or more of the above	66.1	58.1	71.7	54.2

*Time #2 only.

during the year. The differences were especially marked as regards medical and dental services received by children. Statistically significant differences from the control group standard were also found in Group II on having seen a dentist and in Group IV on children having been treated by a physician. Overall, members of the three program groups reported more contacts with physicians and dentists than did members of the control group.

Table 16. Use of medical and dental services by clients and their children

Service**	Group I Control Group (N=56)	Group II Training & Income (N=31)	Group III Special Services (N=46)	Group IV Income Only (N=48)
	- - - Percent - - -			
Have seen a doctor in past year	60.6	80.6	89.1*	77.1
Have been treated by doctor in past year	44.6	41.9	69.5*	64.6
Have seen a dentist in past year	26.8	61.3*	30.4	43.7
Have been treated by dentist in past year	17.9	38.7	28.3*	41.7
Children have seen doctor in past year	62.5	58.1	97.8*	81.2
Children have been treated by doctor in past year	50.0	41.9	78.2*	77.1*
Children have seen dentist in past year	28.6	32.3	84.8*	39.6
Children have been treated by dentist in past year	25.0	19.4	73.9*	33.3
Self or child has serious health problem not being treated	69.6	80.6	84.8	62.5

*Chi square significant. See Footnote, Table 3.

**Time #2 only.

The last item in Table 16 shows that a large percentage of respondents in each group reported that either they or their children were suffering at the time of the interview from serious health problems which were not then being treated. The greater percentages in Groups II and III reporting such problems could be partially the result of heightened sensitivity in these groups as a result of experience with the program inputs.

Participation in formal and informal social activities is sometimes taken as an indicator of social rank and often is treated as an important

channel of social mobility. Few relationships have been more consistently documented in sociology than that between social participation and socio-economic status. The level of participation is lowest in the grouping with lowest status. In many surveys, the level of involvement of the poor in formal organizations has been found to be so low as to make quantitative analysis impossible or meaningless.[1]

Two measures of social participation are shown in Table 17. The first deals with informal participation. There were decreases in the percents of clients in Groups I and IV who reported having two or more friends. In Group II, which had the greatest percent with two or more friends at Time #1, there was no change, and in Group III there was a slight increase. One possible reason for the contrast between Groups III and IV on this variable could be the higher level of group-related activities in the program conducted for Group III.

Formal social participation is shown by the other four items in Table 17. The most significant finding in these data is that there was a major shift in all four client groups away from almost exclusive involvement in religious organizations at Time #1 to a moderate to high level of involvement in secular organizations at Time #2. This shift took place among the clients themselves and among other members of their families. It was perhaps most pronounced among the children. The greatest change occurred in Group III, but did not differ significantly from that in Group I.*

There was also a general increase during the year, although a less dramatic one, in the percent of clients reporting having engaged in selected informal leisure-time activities during the month preceeding the interview. These data are shown in Table 18. Consistent with previous surveys of low-income populations, the percents were very low even at Time #2 in activities which would require expenditures of money. Visiting with friends remained as the most popular leisure activity among those considered. The greater increase in Groups II, III and IV than in the control group in the percents who said they had spent time during the previous month reading books might reflect the adult basic education experience common to the three program groups. As indicated by scores on the cumulative scale, shown as the final item in Table 18, the level of involvement in these leisure-time behaviors declined in Group II while it increased in the other three groups.

One additional indicator of life patterns included in the study had to do with experience of selected problems. As shown in Table 19, there was a decrease in Groups I and IV in percent who said they had gone for a full day during the year with nothing to eat, but a slight increase appeared in Groups II and III. Only a small number of respondents or

---

1. See Kaufman, Wilkinson and Cole, op. cit.

* Civil rights groups were organized in a number of areas of Mississippi for the first time during the year covered by the study. These groups accounted for a small portion of the increase in secular participation in Groups III and IV in Madison County.

Table 17. Change in voluntary social participation

Indicators	Group I Control Group (N=56)	Group II Training & Income (N=31)	Group III Special Services (N=46)	Group IV Income Only (N=48)
Percent with two or more friends				
Time #1	76.8	87.1	78.3	68.7
Time #2	69.6	87.1	82.6	64.6
Change	- 7.2	-	4.3	- 4.1
Percent participating in religious groups only				
Time #1	96.4	93.5	89.1	89.6
Time #2	67.9	83.9	54.3	54.2
Change	-28.5	- 9.6	-34.8	-35.4
Percent participating in a secular organization				
Time #1	3.6	3.2	4.3	4.2
Time #2	23.2	12.9	43.5	35.4
Change	19.6	9.7	39.2	31.2
Percent with other family members in religions only				
Time #1	96.4	83.9	84.8	89.6
Time #2	37.5	64.5	32.6	45.8
Change	-58.9	-19.4	-52.2	-43.8
Percent with other family members in a secular organization				
Time #1	3.6	12.9	8.7	4.2
Time #2	55.4	32.3	65.2	47.9
Change	51.8	19.4	56.5	43.7

members of respondents' families had been arrested at either time period, and few had been evicted from their homes. There were slight increases in Groups III and IV in the percent whose utilities had been cut off during the year for failure to pay their bills, but only a few families were involved.

Personal Orientation

There is a widely held assumption that the attitudes and cognitions of the individual make a great deal of difference in how he responds to resources and problems in his situation. The goal model approach followed in the present study posits changes of a social-psychological

Table 18. Change in percent engaged in selected leisure-time activities in previous month

Activities in Previous month**	Group I Control Group (N=56)	Group II Training & Income (N=31)	Group III Special Services (N=46)	Group IV Income Only (N=48)
		- - - Percent - - -		
Having friends into your home				
Time #1	67.9	87.1	84.8	75.0
Time #2	85.7	87.1	86.9	91.7
Change	17.8	--	2.1	16.7
Visiting friends' homes				
Time #1	67.9	74.2	80.4	70.8
Time #2	75.0	74.2	89.1	83.3
Change	7.1	--	8.7	12.5
Reading books				
Time #1	51.8	45.2	58.7	47.9
Time #2	62.5	70.9	76.1	75.0
Change	10.7	25.7	17.4	27.1
Eating out				
Time #1	14.3	16.1	13.0	12.5
Time #2	26.8	16.1	28.3	4.2
Change	12.5	-	15.3	- 8.3*
Making home repairs				
Time #1	5.4	16.1	23.9	16.7
Time #2	5.4	6.5	15.2	22.9
Change	-	- 9.6	- 8.7	6.2*
Fishing				
Time #1	7.1	16.1	19.6	6.2
Time #2	14.3	3.2	23.9	22.9
Change	7.2	-12.9	4.3	16.7
Sightseeing				
Time #1	8.9	12.9	17.4	8.3
Time #2	17.9	9.7	10.9	6.2
Change	9.0	- 3.2	- 6.5	- 2.1
Attending sports				
Time #1	7.1	9.7	8.7	2.1
Time #2	5.4	16.1	10.9	10.4
Change	- 1.7	6.4	2.2	8.3
Dancing				
Time #1	1.8	12.9	8.7	4.2
Time #2	8.9	9.7	4.3	6.2
Change	7.1	- 3.2*	-4.4	2.0

Table 18. Continued

Activities in Previous Month	Group I Control Group (N=56)	Group II Training & Income (N=31)	Group III Special Services (N=46)	Group IV Income Only (N=48)
		- - - Percent - - -		
Attending movies				
Time #1	-	9.7	8.7	6.2
Time #2	5.4	12.9	19.6	8.3
Change	5.4	3.2	10.9	2.1
Attending parties				
Time #1	1.8	6.5	2.2	2.1
Time #2	8.9	3.2	8.7	10.4
Change	7.1	- 3.3	6.5	8.3
Scores high on leisure behavior scale				
Time #1	16.0	25.8	21.7	16.6
Time #2	24.9	19.3	30.4	18.7
Change	8.9	- 6.5	8.7	2.1

*Chi square significant. See Footnote, Table 3.

**Scale scores of 4 or higher on scale formed by the 11 items above. Coefficient of Reproducibility: T^1=0.93; T^2=0.93.

nature as key intervening or intermediate variables between program components and long-range outcomes. Attention in measurement was thus given to assessing changes in aspirations, achievement orientations, feelings of alienation and levels of satisfaction with community services and opportunities.

Relatively little is known from systematic research about the kinds of changes in personal outlook which signal movement into a mobility channel. It would appear that under certain types of conditions, upward mobility would be facilitated by the adoption on the part of the individual of a negative, perhaps even hostile stance, toward the status quo. An analysis of some of the data from the Time #1 survey has shown that many of those with characteristics such as youth, good health and relatively high education scored highest on the alienation measures.[1] On the other hand, the traditional routes to upward social mobility in this society have been through adoption of the perspective of those of higher social rank. How these two notions might be reconciled is a major question for society at this time as well as for social science.

1. This is shown in Ross, op. cit., Chapter III.

Table 19. Change in experience of selected problems in previous year

Problems	Group I Control Group (N=56)	Group II Training & Income (N=31)	Group III Special Services (N=46)	Group IV Income Only (N=48)
	- - - Percent Who Have - - -			
Been without food for a whole day				
Time #1	16.1	12.9	13.1	37.5
Time #2	14.3	16.1	19.6	22.9
Change	- 1.8	3.2	6.5	-14.6
Been arrested				
Time #1	5.4	-	4.3	2.1
Time #2	1.8	-	4.3	6.3
Change	- 3.6	-	-	4.2
Another member of household arrested				
Time #1	12.5	9.7	6.5	6.3
Time #2	3.6	-	8.7	12.5
Change	- 8.9	- 9.7	2.2	6.2
Been evicted from home				
Time #1	1.8	3.2	-	4.2
Time #2	-	-	-	2.1
Change	- 1.8	- 3.2	-	- 2.1
Had utilities disconnected				
Time #1	12.5	6.5	2.2	4.2
Time #2	3.6	6.5	10.9	10.4
Change	- 8.9	-	8.7	6.2

As an example of some of the interpretive problems facing research such as this and of the possible infusion of attitudinal factors into behavioral performances, the data in Table 20 may be considered. These data are based on results of a non-verbal test, ostensibly of intelligence, administered as part of the interview at Time #1 and again at Time #2. The test required 15 minutes and was usually taken in the home of the respondent. It consisted primarily of a series of four-picture sets. In each set the respondent was asked to mark the one picture which, for example, differed from the others. Raw performance scores of the respondents were translated into stanine ranks according to national norms for adults. As shown in Table 20, many of the scores at Time #1 were in the lowest categories according to the national norms. The major concern, of course, was with changes which might occur during the succeeding year as a result of the special program inputs and other experiences of the clients. As the table shows, the changes were substantial and consistent across the four groups but were in a direction opposite to that expected. Scores were consistently lower at Time #2.

Table 20. Change in non-verbal test* performance scores

Indicators	Group I Control Group (N=56)	Group II Training & Income (N=31)	Group III Special Services (N=46)	Group IV Income Only (N=48)
Percent scoring above lowest category				
Time #1	30.4	45.2	45.7	68.7
Time #2	16.1	22.6	34.8	56.2
Change	-14.3	-22.6	-10.9	-12.5
Percent scoring above lowest two categories				
Time #1	10.7	22.6	8.7	41.7
Time #2	7.1	6.5	8.7	20.8
Change	- 3.6	-16.1**	-	-20.9**

*SRA Non-Verbal Test, Industrial Version.

**Chi square significant. See footnote, Table 3.

The best that can be concluded with the data at hand is that there was a major, general shift in the orientations of the clients during the year. There is no evidence that group assignment and program experience influenced this shift.

In a more traditional vein, occupational and education aspirations may be assumed to form a central component of one's mobility orientation in American society. Table 21 shows changes which occurred in the clients' occupational aspirations and expectations for themselves and for their children. The percentage aspiring to white collar jobs for themselves, which was small to begin with, decreased slightly from Time #1 to Time #2 in Groups II and III and remained stable in Group IV. The percent expecting to acquire a white collar job was also very small and changes were irregular. Aspirations for one's child were generally much higher than for oneself, as were expectations.

The most notable differences among groups, though not statistically significant, were in occupational aspirations and expectations for children. The percent aspiring to and the percent expecting white collar occupations for their children increased more and reached higher levels in Group II than in the other groups. Anticipatory goal deflection (i.e. the difference between aspirations and expectations) increased in Group III while decreasing in the other groups. This suggests that among Group III members there was an increase of the prevalence of conflict between desired goals on the one hand, and perceived chances of attaining those goals on the other.

Table 22 shows that there was an increase in all groups in the percent aspiring to a college education for their oldest child and in the percent expecting the same. The net increase in aspirations, however,

Table 21. Change in occupational aspirations and expectations for self and child

Aspirations/ Expectations	Group I Control Group (N=56)	Group II Training & Income (N=31)	Group III Special Services (N=46)	Group IV Income Only (N=48)
		- - - Percent - - -		
Aspires to white collar or skilled job for self				
Time #1	12.5	12.9	10.9	14.6
Time #2	17.9	9.7	6.5	14.6
Change	5.4	- 3.2	- 4.4	-
Expects white collar or skilled job for self				
Time #1	5.4	3.2	4.3	10.4
Time #2	-	3.2	10.9	6.2
Change	- 5.4	-	6.6	- 4.2
Aspires to white collar job for oldest child				
Time #1	73.2	67.7	67.4	81.2
Time #2	69.6	77.4	71.7	77.1
Change	- 3.6	9.7	4.3	- 4.1
Expects white collar job for oldest child				
Time #1	50.0	45.2	47.8	52.1
Time #2	51.8	61.3	41.3	56.2
Change	1.8	16.1	- 6.5	4.1

was greater than the increase in expectations in all groups except Group IV. The percent expecting their child to graduate from high school only decreased in three groups, while the percent expecting their child to get a college education increased in all groups. This reflects a sharp decline, especially in Groups III and IV, in the percent expecting high school graduation but not college graduation for their child.

While these and the other changes provoke interesting speculations, the differences in patterns of change in aspirations and expectations among the groups were not great enough to be statistically significant. The trends most evident in the data on change were the following: (1) aspirations and expectations for self remained at a low level or declined slightly, (2) aspirations and expectations for children were raised, sharply in some cases, and (3) the increase in aspirations for children was greater than the increase in expectations for children. The control and program groups were more alike than different in exhibiting there patterns.

Table 22. Change in educational aspiration and expectations for oldest child

Aspirations/ Expectations	Group I Control Group (N=56)	Group II Training & Income (N=31)	Group III Special Services (N=46)	Group IV Income Only (N=48)
		- - - Percent - - -		
Aspires to college graduation for child				
Time #1	37.5	41.9	39.1	58.3
Time #2	60.7	54.8	65.2	73.0
Change	23.2	12.9	26.1	14.7
Expects college graduation for child				
Time #1	23.2	29.0	17.4	22.9
Time #2	30.4	32.3	30.4	41.7
Change	7.2	3.3	13.0	18.8
Expects at least high school graduation for child				
Time #1	58.9	51.6	69.6	66.7
Time #2	55.4	54.8	58.7	43.8
Change	- 3.5	3.2	-10.9	-22.9

One measure of the mobility potential of adults is the extent to which they are willing and able to accept hardships and sacrifices in order to increase their economic resources. Under certain conditions, such willingness is indicative of achievement motivation and ability to defer gratification, both of which are widely assumed in the social-psychological literature to be requisites for upward mobility. Under other conditions, lack of such willingness might reflect lack of trust in promises of future pay-off, absence of health and other resources needed to take advantage of opportunities, or inability to view a better future as possible. In either case, lack of willingness or ability to accept inconveniences can be a severe barrier to mobility.

Clients were asked at both time periods whether they would be willing to accept what was described as "a good job, that is one paying $300 to $400 a month," if the job entailed certain conditions. Ten conditions were listed and clients were asked to indicate their willingness or unwillingness to accept the job under each of the conditions taken separately. These ten conditions were found, as in previous research, to form a cumulative scale. As shown in Table 23, there was a remarkable level of consistency from Time #1 to Time #2 in the order among the conditions as indicated by the percents of clients who would be willing to accept the job under them.

Between the two time periods, there was a general tendency for the level of willingness to accept the job under the various conditions to

Table 23. Change in percent willing to accept selected conditions in order to get a job earning $300-$400 a month

Conditions	Group I Control Group (N=56)	Group II Training & Income (N=31)	Group III Special Services (N=46)	Group IV Income Only (N=48)
	- - - Percent Willing - - -			
Work at night				
Time #1	78.6	77.4	80.4	68.8
Time #2	62.5	35.5	78.3	81.3
Change	-16.1	-41.9	- 2.1	12.5*
Give up spare time				
Time #1	60.7	80.6	80.4	87.5
Time #2	62.5	41.9	89.1	87.5
Change	1.8	-38.7*	8.7*	-
Keep political views quiet				
Time #1	58.9	71.0	82.6	83.3
Time #2	60.7	41.9	82.6	72.9
Change	1.8	-29.1	-*	-10.4
Work harder than now				
Time #1	57.1	71.0	84.8	81.3
Time #2	60.7	35.5	93.5	85.4
Change	3.6	-35.5	8.7*	4.1*
Have more responsibility				
Time #1	64.3	64.5	80.4	75.0
Time #2	57.1	41.9	84.8	85.4
Change	- 7.2	-22.6	4.4*	10.4*
Leave friends in community				
Time #1	58.9	58.1	73.9	66.7
Time #2	50.0	38.7	76.1	70.8
Change	- 8.9	-19.4	2.2*	4.1
Leave this community				
Time #1	39.3	35.5	60.9	41.7
Time #2	30.4	16.1	56.5	39.6
Change	- 8.9	-19.4	- 4.4	- 2.1
Be away from family				
Time #1	33.9	32.3	37.0	31.3
Time #2	28.6	6.5	37.0	29.2
Change	- 5.3	-25.8	-	- 2.1
Move around the county a lot				
Time #1	24.9	25.8	41.3	20.8
Time #2	17.8	12.9	28.3	24.9
Change	- 7.1	-12.9	-13.0	4.1

Table 23. Continued

Conditions	Group I Control Group (N=56)	Group II Training & Income (N=31)	Group III Special Services (N=46)	Group IV Income Only (N=48)
	- - - Percent Willing - - -			
Endanger your health				
Time #1	5.4	3.2	8.7	6.3
Time #2	1.8	6.5	6.5	-
Change	- 3.6	3.3	- 2.2	- 6.3
Scores high on Willingness Scale**				
Time #1	51.7	51.6	71.7	64.5
Time #2	44.6	25.8	73.8	64.5
Change	- 7.1	-25.8	2.1	-

*Chi square significant. See Footnote, Table 3.

**Scale scores of 6 or above on scale formed by the 10 items above. Coefficient of Reproducibility: T^1=0.93; T^2=0.92.

decrease. This is shown by the cumulative scale scores and by the individual items. The greatest decrease was in Group II. Contrary to this tendency, there was a statistically significant increase in the percent willing to accept several conditions in Group III and to a slightly lesser extent in Group IV. It is striking that Group II, which received work experience and training during the year, should be the one in which there was a consistent and sharp decrease in percent willing to accept the various conditions, and that Groups III and IV should run more against the general trend in the client population. Part of the reason might be that the context or frame of reference within which the question was answered became more realistic for Group II members during the course of the year. This, for example, was very likely the case regarding the condition, "work harder than you do now," on which the percent willing to accept the job decreased by one-half in Group II but increased in the other groups. The conditions had more objective meaning for those who had been employed. In Groups III and IV, it is probable that increased motivation for income resulting from the program inputs and other factors was less constrained than in Group II by immediate concrete experience of some of these problems.

A somewhat related pattern may be noted in Table 24 which summarizes data on clients' indications of preference for a welfare check versus a job paying selected amounts. The first item in the table shows that there was very little change in the small percent who would prefer a job if it paid $15 a month less than they had been getting from welfare. For many of these clients, a reduction of $15 in monthly income could be disastrous. For others, perhaps, a job paying so little would been seen as hardly worth the effort and cost of arranging for child care, transportation, clothing, etc. The percent who would take a job at $100 a

Table 24. Change in preference of job over welfare check under selected conditions

Preference/ Conditions	Group I Control Group (N=56)	Group II Training & Income (N=31)	Group III Special Services (N=46)	Group IV Income Only (N=48)
		- - - Percent - - -		
Prefer job if monthly pay is $15 less than welfare				
Time #1	5.4	6.5	6.5	6.2
Time #2	12.5	6.5	10.9	6.2
Change	7.1	-	4.4	-
Prefer job if monthly pay is $100 more than welfare				
Time #1	92.9	87.1	95.7	91.7
Time #2	89.3	93.5	91.3	97.9
Change	- 3.6	6.4	- 4.4	6.2
Prefer job if monthly pay is $50 more than welfare				
Time #1	87.5	87.1	93.5	81.2
Time #2	74.9	61.3	84.8	83.3
Change	-12.6	-25.8	- 8.7	2.1
Prefer job if monthly pay is same as welfare				
Time #1	44.6	58.1	47.8	45.8
Time #2	37.5	16.1	39.1	41.7
Change	- 7.1	-42.0	- 8.7	- 4.1
Scores high on Job Preference Scale**				
Time #1	46.4	48.4	56.5	39.6
Time #2	39.3	16.1	41.3	35.4
Change	- 7.1	-32.3	-15.2	- 4.2

*Scale scores 3 and 4 on scale formed by the 4 items above. Coefficient of Reproducibility: T^1=0.90; T^2=0.90.

month more than their welfare check remained high, increasing slightly in Groups II and IV and decreasing in Groups I and III. Where the job would pay only $50 a month more than welfare and where the amounts would be the same, there was a decrease in all groups in percent who would favor the job over the welfare check. As on previous measures, the greatest decrease was in Group II.

These data support the contention that economic rationality is a major factor in job orientation of the welfare poor. As against more popular stereotypes, the picture that emerges from these data shows the clients to be quite careful in their calculations of advantage and

possibility. It would appear that members of Group II, who received more genuine experience in economic matters, became even more rational during the year.

The overall decreases in percent willing to accept adverse conditions in order to hold jobs and percent willing to give up welfare checks for jobs paying little more than they were receiving point to trends which could have important implications for public welfare policy. They point to an increased emphasis on security values within the welfare population, reflecting in part increases in cost of living and, thus, decreases in relative well-being. As one additional example of this trend, there was a decrease in all groups in the percent who said that they would advise their child to take a higher paying job with less job security rather than one paying a moderate income but which he would be certain of keeping.

Selected aspects of the clients' orientations toward public welfare are treated in Tables 25, 26 and 27. The first of these deals with changes in attitudes held by the clients toward people on welfare and thus indirectly toward themselves. Overall there was little change between the two surveys. Clients in all four groups continued to respond to the agree-disagree items in ways which were generally indicative of sympathy toward people on welfare. The first item in Table 25 might be an exception to this trend. On the other hand, the relatively small percentage of clients disagreeing with this item could represent a strong desire to find ways to get people, themselves included, off of welfare and into a status of self-sufficiency. The relatively small changes from Time #1 to Time #2 were not associated with group assignment.

The data in Table 26 show that there was an overall decrease over the year in the percent of clients expressing a generally favorable attitude toward the welfare department and system. Most clients continued to feel that welfare support levels were inadequate and that welfare department workers did not really understand their problems. While changes were slight on both of these items, there was a greater tendency in Group IV , than in the other groups, toward a more negative attitude. On other items, however, the percent expressing approval of the welfare department increased more in Group IV than in any other group. On the last three items, changes in Group II were in sharp contrast with those in Group IV. In Group II, there were substantial decreases in the percent who felt that the welfare department does not play favorites and in the percent who agreed that the welfare department tries to help anyone who really needs help.

Clients were also asked at each time period whether they felt that being on welfare made any difference, either positively or negatively, to other people with whom they associated. Table 27 shows that there were suggestive, though not statistically significant, differences among the groups in changes between Time #1 and Time #2. In Group IV, there was an increase in the percent who felt that their welfare status made a difference to their relatives, while in Groups II and III there was a decrease. There were also decreases in Group II in the percent who thought this status made a difference to grocery store

Table 25. Change in attitudes toward welfare clients

Attitude Items	Group I Control Group (N=56)	Group II Training & Income (N=31)	Group III Special Services (N=46)	Group IV Income Only (N=48)
		- - - Percent - - -		
Disagrees that "there are too many people receiving welfare who should be working"				
Time #1	16.1	22.6	23.9	27.1
Time #2	28.6	22.6	30.4	25.0
Change	12.5	-	6.5	- 2.1
Agrees that "in general, most people getting welfare try to find jobs so that they can support themselves"				
Time #1	78.6	77.4	89.1	77.1
Time #2	85.7	74.2	89.1	95.8
Change	7.1	- 3.2	-	18.7
Disagrees that "most people on welfare could easily get along if their welfare money were stopped"				
Time #1	89.3	67.7	97.8	89.6
Time #2	80.4	80.6	86.9	89.6
Change	- 8.9	12.9	-10.9	-
Scores high on scale of sympathy for welfare clients*				
Time #1	91.0	87.0	95.6	95.8
Time #2	92.8	87.0	95.6	100.0
Change	1.8	-	-	4.2

*Scale scores 0 and 1 on scale formed by the 3 items above. Coefficient of Reproducibility: T^1=0.97; T^2=0.98.

owners and the percent who thought this made a difference to landlords (with both of whom they had regular dealings), but an increase in the percent who felt that it made a difference to other store owners (with whom, perhaps, they had less frequent contacts). These changes in Group II, while involving a small number of clients, are consistent with the dual roles played by members of this group during the year: they were both employed persons and welfare recipients.

Among Group III members, there were increases in percents who thought their welfare status made a difference to grocers and to landlords, respectively, but no change in the percent who thought it made a difference to other store owners. There is some evidence, though not documented systematically in these data, that clients felt that their

Table 26. Change in attitudes toward the welfare department

Attitude Items	Group I Control Group (N=56)	Group II Training & Income (N=31)	Group III Special Services (N=46)	Group IV Income Only (N=48)
		- - - Percent - - -		
Disagrees that "one of the main troubles with welfare is that it doesn't give enough money to get along on"				
Time #1	7.1	3.2	2.2	8.3
Time #2	7.1	9.7	6.5	2.1
Change	-	6.5	4.3	- 6.2
Disagrees that "most of the people in the welfare department do not understand our problems"				
Time #1	21.4	29.0	15.2	12.5
Time #2	16.0	32.3	26.1	8.3
Change	- 5.4	3.3	10.9	4.2*
Agrees that "the welfare department treats everyone the same and does not play favorites"				
Time #1	49.9	58.1	50.0	50.0
Time #2	55.4	35.5	58.7	70.8
Change	5.5	-22.6	8.7	20.8
Agrees that "the welfare department tries to help anyone who really needs help"				
Time #1	78.6	80.6	73.9	58.3
Time #2	73.2	61.3	67.4	83.3
Change	- 5.4	-19.3	- 6.5	25.0
Agrees that "caseworkers really help people solve their problems"				
Time #1	67.9	87.1	56.5	56.2
Time #2	73.2	80.6	67.4	79.2
Change	5.3	- 6.5	10.9	23.0
Scores high on scale of positive evaluation of welfare department**				
Time #1	74.9	77.4	78.2	83.3
Time #2	73.1	67.7	67.3	72.9
Change	- 1.8	- 9.7	-10.9	-10.4

*Chi square significant. See Footnote, Table 3.

**Scores 0-2 on scale formed by the 5 items above. Coefficient of Reproducibility: T^1=0.96; T^2=0.95.

increased incomes, etc. from the program supplements made them appear as better credit risks, particularly in the eyes of landlords and grocery store owners.[1] In Group IV, there was an increase in the percent who felt that their welfare status made a difference with reference to each of the four groups of relevant others.

Table 27. Change in perceptions of others' reactions to one's welfare status

Others/Opinions	Group I Control Group (N=56)	Group II Training & Income (N=31)	Group III Special Services (N=46)	Group IV Income Only (N=48)
		- - - Percent - - -		
Makes a difference to relatives				
Time #1	14.3	19.4	17.4	4.2
Time #2	19.6	6.5	10.9	27.1
Change	5.3	-12.9	- 6.5	22.9
Makes a difference to grocery store owners				
Time #1	57.1	64.5	47.8	37.5
Time #2	53.6	61.3	69.6	45.8
Change	- 3.5	- 3.2	21.8	8.3
Makes a difference to other store owners				
Time #1	41.1	48.4	54.3	27.1
Time #2	49.9	58.1	54.3	52.1
Change	8.8	9.7	-	25.0
Makes a difference to landlords				
Time #1	35.7	70.9	30.4	27.1
Time #2	51.8	64.5	56.5	45.8
Change	16.1	- 6.4	26.1	18.7

In summary, these data on the clients' orientations toward welfare show that (1) there was a continuation over the year of the clients' general attitude of sympathy toward welfare recipients, (2) there was a reduction in the percent expressing favorable attitudes toward the welfare department, although the majority of clients remained favorable, and (3) with the exception of Group II, there was an increase in the percentage of clients who saw their welfare status as making some difference in their relationships with others. In general, the program groups changed in much the same ways as did the control group.

1. See Singh, op. cit.

The clients were also asked to express their agreement or disagreement* with a number of statements reflecting attitudes toward life and social relations in general. Among these were sets of statements which have been treated in previous studies as indicators of powerlessness, isolation, and normlessness -- three components of what has been called alienation.[1] Using the Guttman technique, cummulative scales were developed from the data measuring the powerlessness and isolation components. Changes in scores on these scales and on the items comprising them between Time #1 and Time #2 are shown in Tables 28 and 29. Responses to other items, including those on normlessness which did not scale at either time period, are shown in Table 30.

Table 28. Change in attitudes expressing powerlessness

Attitude Items	Group I Control Group (N=56)	Group II Training & Income (N=31)	Group III Special Services (N=46)	Group IV Income Only (N=48)
			- - - Percent - - -	
Disagrees that "there is little we can do to keep prices from going higher"				
Time #1	-	-	-	-
Time #2	7.1	-	2.2	4.2
Change	7.1	-	2.2	4.2
Disagrees that "there is very little we can do to make sure of permanent world peace"				
Time #1	5.4	6.5	6.5	14.6
Time #2	16.1	6.5	15.2	22.9
Change	10.7	-	8.7	8.3
Disagrees that "there are a few powerful people who run everything around here and there is not much the little guy can do about it"				
Time #1	14.3	9.7	4.3	12.5
Time #2	10.7	12.9	6.5	10.4
Change	- 3.6	3.2	2.2	- 2.1

*Five alternative responses were allowed: strongly disagree, disagree, uncertain, agree and strongly agree. For purposes of analysis and presentation, strongly disagree and disagree were combined as were agree and strongly agree.

1. See Melvin Seemar, "On the Meaning of Alienation," American Sociological Review, 24 (December 1959), 783-791, Singh, op. cit., and Kaufman, Wilkinson and Cole, op. cit.

Table 28. Continued

Attitude Items	Group I Control Group (N=56)	Group II Training & Income (N=31)	Group III Special Services (N=46)	Group IV Income Only (N=48)
			- - - Percent - - -	
Disagrees that "more and more I feel helpless about what goes on around me"				
Time #1	16.1	3.2	26.1	14.6
Time #2	12.5	9.7	23.9	16.6
Change	- 3.6	6.5	- 2.2	2.0
Agrees that "people like myself can change what is happening around here if we speak up"				
Time #1	57.1	61.3	65.2	56.2
Time #2	64.3	67.7	69.6	56.2
Change	7.2	6.4	4.4	-
Agrees that "each of us can do a lot to improve what people think of our county"				
Time #1	73.2	83.9	60.9	79.2
Time #2	83.9	93.5	84.8	85.4
Change	10.7	9.6	23.9	6.2
Scores low on scale of powerlessness*				
Time #1	28.5	12.9	21.7	31.2
Time #2	30.8	16.1	15.2	24.9
Change	2.3	3.2	- 6.5	- 6.3

*Scores 0,1,2 on scale formed by 6 items above (reverse scoring). Coefficient of Reproducibility: T^1=0.92, T^2=0.92.

Powerlessness refers to a subjective feeling of inability to control one's fate or to influence decision-making processes in the community or society. The scale scores, shown as the final item in Table 28, indicate that there was only a small concentration of clients at either time period along the "less-alienated" end of the scale. A majority of the clients expressed strong feelings of powerlessness at both time periods. There were no statistically significant differences among program groups relative to the control group on changes from Time #1 to Time #2 in powerlessness responses.

Isolation responses, which presumably reflect a feeling of being out of touch with others, are shown in Table 29. As with the powerlessness measure, there were no statistically significant differences among

changes in the groups. Respondents were somewhat less clustered in the more isolated scale-score categories than was the case with powerlessness. In the control group and in Group IV, there were increases over the year in the percent of clients scoring on the less-alienated end of the scale. The percent of less alienated scores decreased, however, in Groups II and III.

Table 29. Change in attitudes expressing isolation

Attitude Items	Group I Control Group (N=56)	Group II Training & Income (N=31)	Group III Special Services (N=46)	Group IV Income Only (N=48)
			- - - Percent - - -	
Disagrees that "there are not very many people you can depend on"				
Time #1	8.9	16.1	8.7	6.2
Time #2	5.4	12.9	13.0	4.2
Change	- 3.5	- 3.2	4.3	- 2.0
Disagrees that "sometimes I feel all alone in the world"				
Time #1	16.1	29.0	23.9	16.7
Time #2	16.1	32.3	23.9	29.2
Change	-	3.3	-	12.5
Disagrees that "most people feel lonely a lot of the time"				
Time #1	17.9	9.7	8.7	20.8
Time #2	14.3	16.1	13.0	16.6
Change	- 3.6	6.4	4.3	- 4.2
Agrees that "real friends are as easy as ever to find"				
Time #1	30.4	48.4	23.9	29.2
Time #2	37.5	38.7	21.7	35.4
Change	7.1	- 9.7	- 2.2	6.2
Agrees that "the world in which we live is a friendly place"				
Time #1	74.9	61.3	54.3	75.0
Time #2	69.6	64.5	52.2	70.8
Change	- 5.7	3.2	- 2.1	- 4.2

Table 29. Continued

Attitude Items	Group I Control Group (N=56)	Group II Training & Income (N=31)	Group III Special Services (N=46)	Group IV Income Only (N=48)
			- - - Percent - - -	
Agrees that "people are just naturally friendly and helpful"				
Time #1	71.4	70.9	58.7	52.1
Time #2	66.1	58.1	50.0	75.0
Change	- 5.3	-12.8	- 8.7	22.9
Agrees that "one can always find friends in he acts in a friendly way"				
Time #1	96.4	90.3	97.8	93.7
Time #2	87.5	93.5	93.5	87.5
Change	- 8.9	3.2	- 4.3	- 6.2
Scores low on scale of isolation*				
Time #1	48.1	64.5	45.6	58.3
Time #2	58.9	51.6	41.2	62.4
Change	10.8	-12.9	- 4.4	4.1

*Scores 0,1,2,3 on scale formed by 7 items above (reverse scoring). Coefficient of Reproducibility: T^1=0.92; T^2=0.91.

The remaining items in this set, shown in Table 30, reflect a variety of attitudes all of which have to do at least indirectly with alienation. Most of the items in this grouping have been included in measures of normlessness used in previous studies. As a subjective phenomenon, normlessness refers to a feeling that the rules of society are not being followed, i.e. that in the mainstream of life desirable goals are being attained through illegitimate means. Failure of these items to form a cumulative scale in the present study probably resulted from the wording of items not being geared to the subculture under study.

Taken as single item indicators, the responses and changes shown in Table 30 reflect a picture similar to that shown in Tables 28 and 29. There were few significant differences among groups in patterns of change, but a number of interesting shifts in sentiment. Significant differences were noted in changes in responses on three items about politics and one about picket-lines, neither of which had immediate meaning to many of the clients. One interesting shift was the reduction in all groups in the percent of clients disagreeing with the assertion that lying is necessary to get and hold a good job. There was an increase at Time #2 in Groups I, II, and IV in the percent who indicated that they had considered moving during the previous year, but no change on this in Group III. The number who gave this response, however, was

Table 30. Change in selected attitudes toward society

Attitude Items	Group I Control Group (N=56)	Group II Training & Income (N=31)	Group III Special Services (N=46)	Group IV Income Only (N=48)
		- - - Percent - - -		
Disagrees that "to get a job promotion, you've got to get in good with the boss"				
Time #1	16.1	12.9	15.2	33.3
Time #2	32.1	35.5	34.8	33.3
Change	16.0	22.6	19.6	-
Disagrees that "to get a good paying job, you have to lie a little about yourself and what you can do"				
Time #1	55.4	58.1	67.4	60.4
Time #2	37.5	41.9	63.0	45.8
Change	-17.9	-16.2	- 4.4	-14.6
Disagrees that "if you want a government job, having pull and knowing somebody are more important than ability"				
Time #1	26.8	29.0	34.8	43.8
Time #2	30.4	22.6	67.7	33.4
Change	3.6	- 6.4	32.9	-10.4
Disagrees that "in order to get elected to public office, a candidate has to make promises he knows he won't keep"				
Time #1	35.7	22.6	39.1	60.4
Time #2	28.6	25.8	26.1	33.3
Change	- 7.1	3.2*	-13.0	-27.1*
Disagrees that "the people who run our government must keep a lot of things quiet if they want to stay in office"				
Time #1	7.1	25.8	10.9	10.4
Time #2	10.7	6.5	10.9	8.3
	3.6	-19.3	- *	- 2.1

Table 30. Continued

Attitude Items	Group I Control Group (N=56)	Group II Training & Income (N=31)	Group III Special Services (N=46)	Group IV Income Only (N=48)
			- - - Percent - - -	
Disagrees that "you can't be a success in business and politics without taking advantage of people"				
Time #1	39.3	41.9	47.8	56.2
Time #2	46.4	32.3	65.2	60.4
Change	7.1	- 9.6	17.4*	4.2
Disagrees that "in order to make a lot of money a salesman must use "high-pressure" salesmanship"				
Time #1	32.1	25.8	43.5	52.1
Time #2	26.8	54.8	54.3	33.3
Change	- 5.3	29.0	10.8	-18.8
Disagrees that "if a strike is going to work, you have to stop people from crossing the picket-line, even if somebody gets badly hurt"				
Time #1	23.2	6.5	17.4	27.1
Time #2	14.3	12.9	17.4	22.9
Change	- 8.9	6.4*	-	- 4.2
Disagrees that "I don't get to see my friends as often as I'd really like"				
Time #1	16.1	6.5	30.4	29.2
Time #2	5.4	6.5	19.6	27.1
Change	-10.7	-	-10.8	- 2.1
Disagrees that "people don't ask me to do things with them as often as I'd like"				
Time #1	25.0	19.4	30.4	33.3
Time #2	12.5	12.9	26.1	20.8
Change	-12.5	- 6.5	- 4.3	-12.5
Have considered moving in past year				
Time #1	8.9	16.1	10.9	6.3
Time #2	17.9	22.6	10.9	18.8
Change	9.0	6.5	-	12.5

*Chi squares significant. See Footnote, Table 3.

very small. As indicated earlier, this was a residentially stable population.

Careful examination of the data on alienation responses reveals that there was in fact a great deal of change over the year with a sizeable grouping of respondents becoming more alienated and another grouping becoming less alienated.[1] Apparently, however, these changes occurred independently of the program input-output dynamics of central interest to this study.

Table 31 shows the percent of clients at Time #2 who expressed satisfaction with services, facilities and other characteristics of their communities. The overall finding was that a large percentage of the clients expressed themselves as being satisfied with most items mentioned. Where there were significant differences from the control group, it was in cases where a smaller percent in a program group than in the control group expressed themselves as satisfied. This was the case with Group III on stores and shopping opportunities, with Group IV on friendliness of people, and with Groups III and IV on job opportunities. Among the program groups, Group II had the most consistently high percentage of clients expressing satisfaction.

Table 31. Satisfaction with community characteristics

Characteristics	Group I Control Group (N=56)	Group II Training & Income (N=31)	Group III Special Services (N=46)	Group IV Income Only (N=48)
	- - - Percent Satisfied - - -			
Housing	71.4	77.4	58.7	52.1
Stores and shopping	82.1	87.1	65.2*	56.2
Schools	98.2	93.5	91.3	97.9
Safety in streets	82.1	74.2	76.1	70.8
Churches	98.2	96.8	97.8	97.9
Friendliness of people	100.0	90.3	91.3	89.6*
Job opportunities	50.0	70.9	28.3*	20.8*

*Chi squares significant. See Footnote, Table 3.

1. Singh, op. cit.

CHAPTER III

CONCLUSIONS

Summary of Findings

The purpose of the study was to evaluate the differential influence of the program variables on both short and long-range indicators of client movement toward economic self-sufficiency and improved functioning in society. The three program concepts--training and income, special services, and income only--were to be evaluated through comparison with a control group in a before-after experimental design. Because this was a field study involving cooperation with a state public welfare department and touching the lives of real clients and their families, several deviations from the strict experimental design were necessary. The findings thus provide not a conclusive test but rather a general indication of the consequences of the program concepts.

From a narrow statistical standpoint, the study was able to reveal no significant pattern of differences among the groups in changes resulting from the program variables. The small number of significant chi square values might themselves have resulted from chance factors operating among such a large number of tests as were performed.

From a more positive perspective, the findings of the study can be of value in indicating what has happened over the short run in at least one case. Short of statistical generalization, it may be argued that many of the problems and findings of this study would be replicated in other field trials and applications of the program concepts. Further, the minute changes and suggested patterns which form the main body of findings of the study can be of value as a base for comparison with the results of future studies.

Findings regarding the three major categories of variables may be summarized as follows:

Financial Status measures varied slightly from Time #1 to Time #2 in ways consistent with the program variables. In some cases, changes could be related directly to the program inputs. Such changes as the increase in percent employed in Group II (the Title V training and income group), which resulted directly from a program input, are more appropriately interpreted as program outputs than as indicators of long-range outcomes. There was a reduction in Group III (the IIIS special service group) and in Group IV (the IIIS income-only group) in the percent employed at the time of the interview, and there were increases during the year in these two groups in the percents who had been looking for work.

p. 60 blank

A smaller proportion of the clients in Group IV than in the other groups moved off of welfare or into jobs paying moderate incomes during the year. This was consistent with the increased income acquired by this group through the program supplements.

Groups II and IV, both of which received increased income as a program input, differed significantly from the control group in percent perceiving increases in the availability of resources to meet their needs. Significant increases in Group III were noted only on items such as clothing and medical and dental care which were included in the special services provided under the 1115 program. Much of the increase in income in Groups II and IV was apparently used to cover the family food needs and clothing costs. There were decreases in these groups in percents spending more than $10 a month on several other items. In Group III, the percent spending the indicated amounts in the previous month decreased on all but one item, reflecting in part the availability of special services to this group which covered some of the more expensive needs. Percent allocations of family incomes for various items were relatively steady over the year with the slight changes reflecting program inputs. There was an increase in Group II in the percent in debt $25 or more, while there were decreases in the other groups on this variable.

Life style measures were also related, though less directly, to the short-range effects of program inputs. Improvements in housing status and condition were noted in Group II. In Groups III and IV, there were decreases in the percents with houses rated as clean and yards rated as neat by the interviewers. In Group III, there was a decrease in the percent of clients scoring in the upper ranks on the level-of-living scale while increases were seen in the other groups.

There was no significant pattern of differences among the groups at Time #2 in percent of families eating selected foods regularly or in other food habits and practices. There was a tendency for the program groups to report eating selected foods more often than in the control group. The percent in Group III eating foods in five or more of the seven basic food categories during the two days preceeding the Time #2 interview was greater than in the other two groups but was nearly matched by the percent in the control group.

As expected, a greater percent of the clients in Group III than in the other groups had received medical and/or dental treatment during the year. The percent receiving medical and/or dental service was less in Group IV than in the other program groups, though still greater than in the control group.

Changes in social participation patterns occurred in all groups with the major shift being from almost exclusive religious involvements to an increased percent of clients involved in one or more secular organizations. The greatest change among the program groups in this regard was in Group III, but the control group changed even more. There was also an increase in all groups in the percent engaged in leisure-time activities during the previous months, with the percent

increasing more in the program groups than in the control group and more in Groups III and IV than in Group II.

Personal orientation measures revealed substantial changes over the one-year period, but these could be linked to the program variables in only a few cases. There was a general decline in the level of performance on a nonverbal ability test, probably reflecting a change in attitudes; but this change was more or less constant across the four groups. Likewise, changes in aspirations and expectations for self and for one's child occurred during the year, but were not clearly related to the program variables. There was in Group II a somewhat greater increase than in the other groups in the percent aspiring to white collar occupations for their child and in the percent expecting their child to attain this level. The increases in percent aspiring to a white collar occupation for their child and percent aspiring to college graduation for their child were relatively large in Group III, but were not matched in this group by increases in the percent expecting their child to attain these ends.

Between the two interviews there was a decrease in the percent of clients willing to accept a job under selected conditions of hardship and inconvenience. The greatest decrease was in Group II. In Groups III and IV, there was an increase in the percent willing to accept the job under several of the conditions. There was also a general decrease in the percent willing to accept a job paying little more than welfare. Again the greatest decrease was in Group II.

There was little change in attitudes toward welfare clients. Most clients continued to have sympathetic attitudes toward persons in this status. In all groups, there was a slight decrease in percent holding a favorable attitude toward the welfare agency. On the attitude items on which the greatest changes occurred, there were contrasting patterns in Groups II and IV. Group II decreased in percent favorable to the agency while Group IV increased. In addition, there was a decrease in Group II but an increase in each of the other three groups in the percent who felt that their welfare status made a difference in their relationships with others.

On measures of powerlessness, isolation and other feelings of alienation, there were few changes which could be related to the program variables. There was a tendency, though not pronounced, for the percent of Group II clients giving more alienated responses to increase while this percent decreased in Groups III and IV. But to the contrary, there was a slightly greater tendency for Group II clients than for those in Groups III and IV to express themselves as satisfied with selected community characteristics at Time #2. Changes in outlook of the clients apparently occurred more or less independently of the program variables.

Group Comparisons

The findings and their implications may be more clearly indicated by considering the major pattern of changes which prevailed in each of the groups.

Group I: Control Group

It would appear from the above that experience with the program variables constituted only one of a number of influential forces in the lives of the clients in Groups II, III, and IV during the year. There were changes common to members of these groups and, presumably, to the larger population of AFDC recipients. The changes occurring in Group I, the members of which were never identified to the program staff, should be more or less representative of these commonalities.

The economic status of the control group members remained very low with only a slight increase in percent employed and earning more than 50¢ an hour. With increased living costs due to inflation, clients in this group tended to perceive of themselves as becoming worse off economically with the passage of time. They made relatively minor changes in budgeting patterns during the year, but fewer reported spending the benchmark amounts for selected items at Time #2 than at Time #1.

There was a slight improvement in housing status in this group, but not enough to overcome the prevailing conditions of housing inadequacy and poverty of material possessions. Foods of the various sorts considered in the Time #2 survey were eaten with less frequency in the control group than in the program groups, and medical and dental services were infrequently used. The major shift which occurred during the year from exclusively religious to some secular participation was seen clearly in this group, and there was an increase in leisure-time activities.

There was a tendency in the control group for occupational aspirations and expectations, for self and child, to converge while rising only slightly. Educational aspirations for one's child went up greatly. The percent willing to undergo hardships to get a job paying $300 to $400 a month decreased during the year as did the percent preferring a job over welfare when the job paid little more. Attitudes toward welfare clients remained sympathetic, and the percent with favorable attitudes toward the welfare department decreased only slightly. There was an increase in the percent who thought that being on welfare made a difference to others. While remaining at a fairly high level, the percent of clients in Group I expressing alienated attitudes decreased somewhat during the year. Among the four groups, the control group included the greatest percent of members who expressed satisfaction with various community characteristics.

Group II: Title V Training & Income

It was noted in Chapter I that for Group II the level of financial input was higher than that for Group III and nearly the same as that for IV. As the only program group in Attala County, it is also possible that these clients received more individualized attention from the caseworker. These clients, unlike the others, were subjected during the year to the dual role of employee and welfare client. The changes in their responses from Time #1 to Time #2 in many ways reflect these unique program outputs.

The financial status of this group increased as did its feeling of economic well-being and its willingness, for example, to go into debt. Improved housing status and increased level of living accompanied increased income. Contrary to the pattern of other groups, there was a decrease in participation in various leisure-time activities.

Accompanying these were interesting social-psychological changes. There was an apparent trend in Group II for clients to become much more selective in their orientations toward work and upward social mobility. Aspirations for their children tended to go up, but the percent willing to undergo various inconveniences to get a job paying $300 to $400 a month decreased as did the percent preferring a job over welfare, unless the job paid over $50 a month more. There was a tendency for Group II clients to become more critical of welfare and a slight increase in the percent expressing feelings of alienation.

The evidence is clear that Group II members had a significant economic and social experience as a result of the program variables and that this experience was, at the time of the follow-up interview, having influence in a number of areas of the clients' lives. Responses in Group II appear to have been more strongly affected by the program variables than were those in either of the other program groups.

Group III: 1115 Special Services

Influence of the program variables appeared to have been restricted to fewer areas of the lives of the Group III members than was found for Group II members. On a number of variables, changes in Group III were more like those in the control group than in the other program groups. This was the case with measure of financial status and of feelings about the adequacy of resources to meet family needs. Except in those items where needs had been served by program inputs, such as medical and dental treatment and clothing, the clients in Group III tended to see their economic status as remaining constant or declining during the year. The percent spending $40 or more for food in the previous month, as an example, was reduced by one-third in this group while it increased in Groups II and IV.

While there was some reallocation in Group III of funds formerly used for items being provided through the special program, this affected the overall budgeting pattern of these families in only a minor way. In most cases, the special services provided through the 1115 program did not free money which had previously been spent by the clients to meet these needs. In many cases, the needs were not being met prior to initiation of the special services program.

The relative absence of new financial inputs in this group was likely a major factor in the reduction in the percent of clients in debt, in the percent living in "clean" houses with "neat" yards and in the percent scoring above the mid-point on the level of living index. As expected, Group III stood out among the others in percent

receiving medical and dental treatment during the year. The pattern of social participation in Group III was much like that in Group I, but with Group III most pronounced among the program groups in the move toward secular participation.

The attitudinal responses and changes among Group III members seemed to express a greater sense of frustration than in the other groups. There was a tendency for them to increase their aspirations for their child's occupation and education but not to increase, and in some cases to decrease, their expectations that the child would attain the desired levels. There was an increase in this group, contrasted with decreases in the others, in percent willing to accept a job under conditions of hardship. This group had the greatest decrease in percent expressing a favorable attitude toward the welfare department and increases in the percent expressing general feelings of alienation. While the differences were slight in many of these cases and the danger of overgeneralization is great, the pattern in Group III was consistent with what might be expected in a group which conceived of itself as a special demonstration group but which did not acquire as a result any significant increase in economic resources.

Group IV: 1115 Income Only

With the exception of the required participation in adult basic education classes and involvement in a few of the special classes organized in Madison County for the special services group, Group IV received nothing more than a monthly income supplement. The average monthly income of these clients subsequently exceeded the averages in Groups I and III and was approximately the same as in Group II. Participation in this program required the least commitment on the part of the clients, and there were no dropouts during the year.

The percent employed and the percent making more than 50¢ an hour decreased greatly in Group IV. It would appear that the clients moved away from low-paying jobs and became more selective when they had the back-up support of the income supplements. They, as did clients in Group II, conceived of themselves as having more money available to meet their needs. There were statistically significant increases in this group in percent spending $50 or more per month for food, percent spending $20 or more per month for rent, percent spending $10 or more per month for medical treatment and percent spending $10 or more per month for clothing. There was a reduction in this group in the percent in debt.

Changes in housing status and level of living in Group IV were generally in line with those in the control group as were responses on family food consumption patterns. The percent receiving the various medical and dental services during the year was less in Group IV than in Group III, but exceeded the percent in the control group in every case and the percent in Group II in every case except one. The shift toward secular participation of Group IV members was nearly as great as that of Group III members.

There was a tendency, as in the control group, for aspirations and expectations in Group IV to converge. There were significant increases in the percents of Group IV members willing to work at night, to work harder and to take on more responsibilities to get a job paying $300 to $400 a month, but no overall change in their scale scores on this item. Preference for a job over welfare increased in this group under the conditions of the job paying $50 or $100 a month more than welfare. As in the other groups, members of Group IV remained generally sympathetic toward welfare clients, and the percent with favorable attitudes toward the welfare department decreased. Feelings of powerlessness became slightly more widespread in this group during the year, but there was a decrease in isolation scores. The smallest percents in this group of the four expressed satisfaction with community services and characteristics.

Overall Differences

There is no way to say conclusively with this evidence which group among these took the greatest step toward becoming upwardly mobile. Perhaps none did; or perhaps they all did but in different ways. The greatest number of significantly different changes occurred in Group II, followed by Group IV. In Group III, changes were generally restricted to areas of life within which program inputs had had direct influence. Important changes occurred also in the control group during the year, and some of these were such as to raise at least the possibility that program inputs might have had negative influence in some cases.

The changes in Group II were costly, in terms of income supplements, cost of instruction, and caseworker time and energy. There was also a problem of getting clients to agree to participate in the Title V programs. The expense of the special services program for Group III was perhaps less per client, but the effect on family functioning was also less pervasive than in the other groups. Most of the expense in the program for Group IV was concentrated in the income supplements. The results in Group IV were more clearly seen in immediate changes in family financial status than in style of life or personal orientation.

One way to compare the groups is to speculate as to the effects of withdrawing the program inputs. There is some evidence that work experience and training in Group II was beginning by the time of the second interview to effect the degree of rationality in the clients' orientation toward work. At the same time, clients in this group came to be very dependent upon the caseworker for many of the things associated with their employment, including placement in the job itself. There was then in this group a tenuous mix of dependency support and independency training.

In Group III, there was less of an experience of momentarily elevated economic status, but there was at least a taste of a better life in the experience of having some of one's needs for self and children met, in some cases for the first time. Members of this

group tended to become more eager to work and more ambitious in their goals, especially in their goals for their children. But at the same time, there was a tendency for the Group III clients to become more frustrated and pessimistic. Frustrated ambition might serve as a "push" toward upward mobility. On the other hand, it could be a block.

The immediate effect of program termination in Group IV, as in Group II, would be a substantial reduction in financial status. Clients in Group IV would lose less than those in Group II in terms of caseworker services and training-experience opportunities, but a little more money; and perhaps this would be less frustrating. But Group IV members would not have had some of these experiences. Nor would they have had the directive guidance toward meeting medical, dental and other needs that was given to Group III. It appears, however, that in Group IV (and in Group II) the increased income was used primarily to meet essential needs.

Policy Implications

Apart from the matter of endorsing one over the other of these program concepts, which would be inappropriate for obvious reasons in this study, there are a number of policy implications growing out of the demonstration project and the evaluation data. One is that substantial change in the status, life styles and personal orientations of welfare clients will require substantial inputs. There is apparently no cheap way to deal with the massive problem of moving a family out of poverty. The inputs into the programs studied, though great by comparison to usual levels of support for AFDC families, were small in absolute terms; and the resultant changes were also small. In neither of the program groups did the families even come close to being out of a condition of severe poverty. Throughout the data, there is the suggestion that the program variables represented only one of several kinds of forces operating in the clients' lives. From a middle-class perspective, the clients in the four groups remained more alike than different, and more like the poor than the non-poor.

Yet even at the micro-level, there appeared to be a linear tendency for increases in mobility potential to follow from increases in total input. Level of input was the most predictive factor in the study.

A second implication is that programs aimed toward meeting the needs of children and toward facilitating the upward mobility of children of welfare clients should evoke immediate positive responses. There was no indication that the mothers in either group were preparing their children for a life on welfare, although many had doubts about whether their children could overcome major barriers to success.

While no reliable measures of short-range changes in child behavior were available for the study, it is obvious from a number of tables that clients in all groups had great hopes for their children, and that this was heightened by the program variables in Groups II, III and IV.

A third implication has to do with the relationship between behavior modification and attitude change. More of the former was found in this study in response to the program variables. There were changes by many clients on measures of attitudes and orientations, but in only a few cases did these changes differentiate among the groups. This would indicate that the changes in behavior brought about by the program variables were not deep-seated — that self concepts, aspirations and attitudes were less affected than was behavior. Sustained inputs over a long period of time affecting many areas of life would likely be needed to have a sizable impact at this social-psychological level. At the same time, there is a policy question as to whether attitude change, which is apparently more difficult to bring about, should be the focus of a public welfare program. Independence of attitudes might prove to be an essential part of economic independence.

A fourth policy implication is that mobility-inducing programs which deal only with the program resources of the individual tend to ignore other major forces in the lives of welfare clients. The large number of measures in this study on which change variances were not accounted for underlines the existence of these forces. Under field conditions, experimental design can rarely result in randomization of these extraneous factors. Consequently, there are unexplained influences of a sociological, psychological and physiological nature in the data. In the present study, for example, it would be difficult to overestimate, but impossible to assess exactly, the influence of such factors as the community stratification structure, the structure and role of the state and county welfare departments, the occupational structure in Mississippi and the South, and the status of black-identity, civil-rights and welfare-rights movements. Policy decisions must be made with knowledge of these factors as well as with information on the personal responses of clients to program inputs.

A fifth implication has to do with the ethics of test-demonstration research on poverty and social mobility. There is a tendency on the part of both clients and caseworkers to respond to these programs while they are in operation as though they were permanent features of the institutionalized welfare system. The clients are often in such abject poverty that caseworkers are highly motivated to make available to them whatever benefits, however temporary, the demonstration program might afford. The ethical problem arises when such programs are terminated. In the present study, the programs were ended several months after the Time #2 survey, the program staff was disassembled and most of the clients from Groups II, III and IV were returned to their former status. Speculations such as those presented above that there might be long-range benefits from having been in the programs temporarily remain

as little more than speculations. The strong alternative possibility is that there was a frustrating let-down followed by regression and alienation.